THE INDIAN MUSLIMS

A DOCUMENTARY RECORD

PROF. SHAN MUHAMMAD

Islamic Book Centre

H. O. 25, B. Masson Road
P.O. Box, 1625

Sales. 26, Paisa Akhbar.
Anarkali.

LAHORE

ALLIED BOOKS

★ The Aligarh Movement
(1864—1898)
3 VOLS.

★ Successors of
SIR SYED AHMED KHAN

★ UN-PUBLISHED LETTERS
OF ALI BROTHERS

THE INDIAN MUSLIMS

A DOCUMENTARY RECORD

(1900-1947)

VOLUME VIII

THE COMMUNAL STRIFE

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The period between 1916–1922 was a glorious one from the view-point of Hindu-Muslim relations. Both the communities stood side by side to fight against the British for the independence of India. The Hindu leaders participated in the annual sessions of the Muslim League and the Muslims also joined in majority the annual sessions of the Indian National Congress. There was a perfect amity. But this could not continue. The period following the suspension of the non-cooperation movement found the two communities in bitter communal struggle. The dream of the nationalists for a united India was shattered to pieces.

The bitterness of relations between the two communities started with the Moplah rebellion and the Kohat riots. Throughout the year 1922–23 numerous communal riots took place e.g., at Amritsar, Multan, Sindh, Ajmer, Allahabad, Moradabad, Meerut, Panipat, Jabbalpore, Gonda, Agra, Rae Bareli and Saharanpur. The leaders of both the communities tried to pacify but, in an atmosphere of communal frenzy, their appeals fell on deaf ears.

Many reasons were attributed to this change. It was said that the fall of the Turks tended Indian Muslims to look to some Islamic country and Afghanistan being close to India's northern border was their choice. Rumours were afloat that Afghan invasion was imminent on India and the Muslims were to help the Ameer of Afghanistan in the pursuit of his goal. Maulana Mohammad Ali immediately refuted such unfounded rumours and declared that 'if the Ameer of Afghanistan were to invade India, Indian Muslims would be prepared to fight against him with their Hindu brethren'. But such assurances had no meaning and failed to produce the desired effect. The two communities so united a few years ago were now poles asunder. Cow slaughter and music-before-the-mosque were other vital issues which further led to Hindu-Muslim estrangement. Small incidents that hitherto passed unnoticed were now considered communal and therefore, highlighted. Shuddhi and Sanghatan movements among the Hindus gave rise to counter-organisations among the Muslims.

The only solution to bring them back to their normal relations was found in joint conference. With the efforts of Dr. Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari, Ali Brothers, Pt. Madan Mohan Malaviya, Maulana Azad, Pt. Motilal Nehru, Sir Mohammad Shafi, Annie Beasant, Dr. Syed Mahmood, Sarojini Naidu, M. A. Jinnah, Lala Lajpat Rai, Hakim Ajmal Khan, a unity conference was called in October 1924 which pledged for the unity among the different religions. A month later, Gandhiji himself called a similar conference at Bombay to frame a scheme for the representation of all communities in the legislative bodies. Jinnah also participated in that conference. It should be remembered that Jinnah was still a nationalist and to bridge the

gulf between the two warring communities he appealed to them for peace. He said—'I have not come to say what the Mussalmans want. We have come to sit with you as co-workers. Let us put our heads together not as Hindus or Mahommedans but as Indians.' At every stage the communal representation was condemned by the Hindus who considered it an evil and an obstacle in the evolution of true nationalism. To the critics of communal representation, Jinnah again replied—'I ask you to consider this question not in the interest of the Hindu or Mahommedan community but as one united nation which should stand against those who do not want to give us self-government. If any solution is put forward which will further our country's progress I shall whole-heartedly support it, but remember that we have not only to win our liberty but also keep it. Any patch-up agreement by way of altering the figure of representation would only be a backward slip. Let us not try to divide the loaves and fishes but try to evolve a scheme which would further the interest of Swaraj and unity in the country.'

But in spite of the efforts of the leaders of both the communities communal riots continued. Shuddhi and Sanghatan movements, to convert the non-Hindus to Hinduism and to organise the Hindus, were faced by the Tabligh and Tanzeem movements to proselytize the non-Muslims and organize the Muslims. Muslims were so much antagonised that Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew was said to have remarked that 'communal water had much overflown and that the Lucknow Pact—a charter of Hindu-Muslim unity—should be burnt'. Communal unity appeared to be a distant goal. Lala Lajpat Rai still held that 'the Shuddhi and Sanghathan have come to stay.' Even such advocates of national unity and themselves staunch nationalist Muslims like Hakim Ajmal Khan and the Ali Brothers felt the situation very unfavourable for communal unity. They charged the Hindu leaders of openly exciting the Hindus against the Muslims. The Khilafatists voiced their doubt about the intentions of the Hindu leaders for Swaraj. A volunteer corps of 10,000 volunteers was planned under the leadership of Maulana Mohammad Ali in Delhi to safeguard Muslim interests against riots. Thus the leaders of both the communities were challenging each other and did not realise for a minute that they were uprooting the very foundation of national unity.

To meet the situation special session of the Khilafat Committee was convened at Delhi in 1926. Maulana Mohammad Ali referred to cartain Hindu celebrities who were creating new Indian histories which reflected adversely on the Muslims. He said that the Muslims were the advocate of Swaraj. In communal matters a policy of self-restraint was suggested and the conference resolved that 'wherever there may be a possibility of tension between Hindus and Muslims or wherever a disturbance has actually taken place owing to communal feelings, the Khilafat Committee should do all to get the matter settled amicably...... and achieve an honourable compromise between the parties through prominent Hindu and Muslim leaders of the provinces.'

The chain of communal riots weakened the reliance of the Muslims on

the Muslim League and the Khilafat Committee. The Bengal Muslim Party in Bengal, Independent Muslim Party in Aligarh and United Muslim Party in Bulandshahr and many other such parties sprang up with the proclaimed aim of safeguarding the Muslim interests.

Not only were the issues like cow slaughter or music-before-the-mosque the subject of discussion in this conflagration, but Muslim representation in the legislative councils and government services also formed the subjects of heated debates. Muslims felt that they were under-represented both in legislatures and services and wanted to continue separate-electorates in legislature and reservation of seats in the government services. The opposition of the Hindus regarding these two led the Muslims feel that the Congress had now ceased to be a national body. It was a Hindu organisation, protecting only Hindu interests and dominated by Hindu politicians voicing Hindu sentiments. The Eighteenth session of the All-India Muslim League was called under the shadow of this situation. Letters were published in the newspapers for the Muslims to participate in the session and further asked them to be alert to secure their dignity and self-respect. In this session Jinnah earnestly appealed to the leaders of the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha to accept the hand of friendship of the Mohammedan community, to meet and exchange views in real seriousness to find out a solution. Later Sir Mohammad Shafi expressed his profound concern on Hindu-Muslim relations and accused the Hindu leaders of inciting their co-religionists against the Muslims. He appealed both the communities to realise that they were the children of one common motherland. All their efforts, though not fully successful, lessened the communal frenzy to a great extent.

the Muslim League and the Khilafat Committee. The Bengal Muslim Party in Bengal, Independent Muslim Party in Aligarh and United Muslim Party in Bulandshahr and many other such parties sprang up with the proclaimed aim of safeguarding the Muslim interests.

Not only were the issues like cow slaughter or music before the mosque the subject of discussion in this conflagration, but Muslim representation in the legislative councils and government services also formed the subjects of heated debates. Muslims felt that they were under-represented both in legislatures and services and wanted to continue separate electorates in legislature and reservation of seats in the government services. The opposition of the Hindus regarding these two led the Muslims feel that the Congress had now ceased to be a national body. It was a Hindu organisation, protecting only Hindu interests and dominated by Hindu politicians voicing Hindu sentiments. The Eighteenth session of the All-India Muslim League was called under the shadow of this situation. Letters were published in the newspapers for the Muslims to participate in the session and further asked them to be alert to secure their dignity and self-respect. In this session Jinnah earnestly appealed to the leaders of the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha to accept the hand of friendship of the Mohammedan community, to meet and exchange views in real seriousness to find out a solution. Later Sir Mohammad Shah expressed his profound concern on Hindu-Muslim relations and accused the Hindu leaders of inciting their co-religionists against the Muslims. He appealed both the communities to realise that they were the children of one common motherland. All their efforts, though not fully successful, lessened the communal frenzy to a great extent.

SECTION 11

THE COMMUNAL STRIFE

1

THE POLITICAL FUTURE OF INDIAN MUSSULMANS SPEECH BY AFTAB AHMED KHAN AT MAHOMMEDAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE

Gentlemen, let us be perfectly clear about this extremely important question. The political problem of India consists, in the main, of the three elements : (1) the British Government, (2) the Hindu majority, and (3) the Muslim minority.

If the Muslim minority desires to adopt a correct policy it should clearly realise the position of the other two elements and its own relations with them.

Sir Syed and his school of thought have always regarded the presence of British rule in India as a guarantee for her peace and progress and the most effective means of solving the Indian problem: and loyalty to British rule has been an integral part of their programme. The events and experience of the last few years should confirm and convince us of the soundness of this policy. But British rule is not a fixed or immutable entity so far as the actual power and control of the dominant factor is concerned. The process of transference of power from the British to the Indian element has been going on, more or less, ever since 1860, and the new reforms have now brought it to a stage when the silver lines of the distant Swaraj are visible. We should realise the full significance of the fact that the ideal of Swaraj or responsible self-government in India now definitely finds place not only in the Act of Parliament but in King's own proclamation. This means that every loyal citizen is bound to forward the cause of Swaraj, and so far as the Indian Muslims are concerned, I have already said that, both as sons and citizens of India, it is their duty to serve their motherland to the best of their ability. Therefore, so far as the attainment of Swaraj is concerned, it should be our definite policy to co-operate in full with our fellow countrymen.

RESULT OF SWARAJ

But now gentlemen, we come to the crux of our difficulty, for the attainment of Swaraj means, in effect, the predominance of the Hindu majority, and with them our relations are not yet on a sound footing. Out of this situation arise special needs and interests which it is our duty to meet and safeguard. There is thus a conflict between our position as sons of India and our interests as the Muslim minority, in this country, and it is this which

makes our problem most serious and perplexing. The question is : how are we to solve this difficulty ?

Gentlemen, as this stupendous issue has a very important bearing upon our educational problem it is necessary to consider it on this occasion. It appears to me that it is in the solution of and triumph over such difficulties that the real value of great principles is tested. Let us give some chance to the great principles of Islam which are the heritage of every Muslim and are full of dynamic force and clear guidance. Let truth and wisdom be our sheet anchor, and with their light and lead face facts—facts which are the determining factor in our future destiny in this land. What are those facts ?

The first fact is that the supreme power in this country is in the hands of the British who are maintaining peace and order, and are protecting our persons, property and other rights such as we possess. In return from the benefit we thus enjoy it as our duty to be true to the Government which ensures them. There should therefore be no wavering or uncertainty on this point.

The second fact is that both the Act of Parliament and the royal word are pledged to prepare India for Swaraj, the highest political ideal which any nation or country can aspire to. The principle of *Nayabat* demands that the Muslim sons of India should be among the foremost patriots in accomplishing this great purpose, for, it is only as sons of India that we can legitimately claim any right of citizenship in this country. In return for the rights and previleges we now possess, and in justification for any that we may demand or secure in the future, it is our duty to be true to our motherland. There should therefore, be no wavering or uncertainty on this point.

The third fact is that, under existing conditions in India, any advance towards or the attainment of Swaraj means, in effect, an extension in the power of the Hindu majority which does not command the confidence of the Muslim minority whose special interests are thus imperilled. In the interest of our ultimate unity as well as to safeguard the future of one community it is imperative to have a separate communal programme and organization for the defence of our special interests. This is most vital, and no flights of idealism should blind us to the realities of our situation in this country. So far as the attainment of Swaraj, on the constitutional lines and by constitutional means, is concerned we should co-operate in full with our fellow countrymen, but so far as our special interests are concerned, for their safety and security, we must depend upon our own efforts and organization. There should, therefore, be no wavering or uncertainty on this point.

The fourth fact is that political future of India is being forged and shaped in the Councils, Municipal and District Boards, and in the various services and departments of Government where civic rights and requirements whether general or special, are considered and determined. These are the fields where national as well as communal battles are to be fought and won. It is there that we should discriminate between general and special interests, and it is

upon the unity, capacity, courage and independence of Muslim representatives in these places that our political future mainly depends. Pursuit of common communal policy, on some such lines as I have indicated by Muslim representatives in all Councils and public position and activities is absolutely essential for securing effect and respect for the voice and views of the Muslim minority. There should, therefore, be no wavering or uncertainty on this point.

The fifth fact is that in this age and country mere brute force is powerless and futile—it is culture and character, organization and discipline which constitute the real strength and asset of nations and individuals. Whether for the service of our motherland or the cause of our community, it is weapons such as these which we absolutely need. Mere cries or curses complaints or contentions, fists or physical force cannot accomplish much—it is the constitutional method which is indispensable and most effective. There should therefore, be no wavering or uncertainty on this point.

The sixth fact is that it is only by means of education of the right kind, organized on a scale and in a manner suited to our special needs and position, that the community can be equipped with the weapons and the capacity they require for passing through this great ordeal with success. There should, therefore, be no wavering or uncertainty on this point.

Source: Presidential Address at the Thirtysixth session of the All India Mahommedan Educational Conference, Dec. 26–31, 1923, held at Aligarh.

2

MUSLIM REACTION ON KOHAT RIOTS

Soon after the Kohat tragedy Mahatma Gandhi arrived at Delhi, and it was then that the Editor of this Review suggested to him that Mahatma Gandhi and he should immediately proceed to Kohat, see things for themselves, do what they could to restore peace and bring about a reconciliation between the two communities, and a settlement on terms that would do justice and be honourable to both, and failing this, publish the findings at which they had arrived after the fullest possible inquiry on the spot, and without giving to the parties time to manufacture their cases for presentation before law-courts. It was not that the stoppage of the two on the way before they reached Kohat was not apprehended. But since such an apprehension was inevitable in any case, it was more advisable to take the risk at once, when the authorities were not prepared for an adverse decision, and when at least the local officials, and even the Chief Commissioner of the Frontier

Province perhaps, would hesitate before stopping the peace-makers, than later, when they would have had time to make up their minds to and obtain instructions from the Government of India.

I

The depressing experience of delay which Saharanpur had provided was before the Editor of this Review, and it was that which had led him to say in the course of his Address as President of the Indian National Congress at Cocanada :

'I know that Hindu-Muslim relations to-day are not precisely those that they were two years ago. But is it possible for any honest and truly patriotic Indian to say that either community is wholly blameless, and that the guilt is entirely one community's ? Friends, I do not believe in diplomacy, and certainly not in that variety of it which is called secret diplomacy. I do not wish to imitate Sir Roger de Coverley and put you off with the diplomatic dictum : 'Much can be said on both sides of the question'. Most regrettable events have unfortunately occurred in Malabar, at Multan, at Agra, at Saharanpur and elsewhere, and I am prepared to support the creation of a National Tribunal to judge the respective guilt of the two communities. For it cannot be gainsaid even by the community that has suffered the most that complaints have been made by members of the other community as well, and obviously it would neither be fair nor productive of any satisfactory result if either community is saddled with all the guilt and denounced without an adequate enquiry. I did not shrink at Delhi from proposing the appointment of a truly representative Committee of Enquiry; but, for reasons which it is not necessary to state here, no result has yet been achieved of such a committee's appointment. Two things are, however, patent. The law-courts established by Government cannot stop their work while we adjudge the guilt of the two communities. And, while it is difficult to arrive at the truth by a national enquiry after witnesses have given their testimony, true or false, on oath before the courts of law of the Government, reconciliation itself, which is even more important than the investigation of the truth, is not made easy by the punishment awarded to those who are found guilty by such courts, not unoften on evidence which is not free from suspicion.'

Mahatma Gandhi did not reject the suggestion made to him, but his decision was certainly delayed. In the meantime Hakeem Ajmal Khan Saheb, who had to leave his ailing daughter and other members of his family at Kashmir almost unattended, when he had himself returned to meet the Mahatma and assist him in arriving at a settlement between Hindus and Muslims at Delhi after its terrible riots, had to go at least as far as Rawalpindi to bring his family back, and returned from the latter place after having met the Hindu refugees from Kohat. There is a large section of the Hindu press, chiefly in the Punjab, which lives on the abuse of Muslim nationalist

leaders, and which represents the still larger section of narrow-minded and bigoted Hindus who have been carrying on a regular campaign ever since Mahatma Gandhi was released, and have produced something very like a 'stage of siege' in order to convert him from the Mussulmans, and particularly from the Ali Brothers. Well, we wonder if it is any use reminding this section that it was Hakeem Ajmal Khan Saheb, one of the much abused Muslim leaders, whom the narrow-minded in his own community do not spare either, who first brought to Mahatma Gandhi the detailed story of the sufferings of the Kohat refugees at Rawalpindi as it had been narrated to him by these refugees themselves. The Hakeem Saheb had no opportunity of verifying all that he had heard; but he considered it his duty to repeat the story to the Mahatma exactly as he had heard it. It was a Wednesday when the Mahatma is silent for the best part of the day, and he was therefore unable to consult any one, even if he wished to do it, before resolving to undertake his long fast of 21 days. We have not yet been able to get rid of the idea that this fast would not have been undertaken if Mahatmaji had been in more robust health, and that it was very much akin to his breaking down in the A.I.C.C. meeting at Ahmadabad three months earlier. The outside stimulus, as the present writer stated last January, was there in both cases; but the reaction would have been less dramatic and pathetic if the Mahatma had been physically fitter and fully able to exercise over his emotion the iron control that is so characteristic of him. This is, however, a very delicate topic, and it has been touched upon in these columns for the second time with still greater reluctance than on the first occasion, and only because it came in the way of the Hindus to which we have referred and because it came in the way of the adoption of the suggestion in favour of any early investigation of the Kohat affair on the spot. It has been made out that the Mahatmaji had by his support of the Khilafat cause, and, by inducing other Hindus also to echo his sentiments, encouraged the Mussulmans to become fanatical, and had thus indirectly led them to use violence against the Hindus, and that, at last on discovering his mistake, he was doing penance for having betrayed his own community. It was that fast, however, which prevented an early investigation of the whole matter on the spot presuming, of course, that Government would not have stepped in even then, as it has done since, and prevented such an investigation, and, like that fast itself, the statements published by Mahatma Gandhi and Maulana Shaukat Ali in which the much later and far less satisfactory inquiries made at Rawalpindi have culminated, are now being exploited by the same section of the Hindu community.

Anything that comes to us from Mahatma Gandhi or from Maulana Shaukat Ali is entitled to the greatest respect and the most careful consideration; but the circumstances in which their statements on the Kohat affairs have come to us compel us to say that we cannot characterise them as reports of an independent inquiry conducted into the Kohat happenings. There are nothing more than the different impressions made by the printed

case of the Hindus and the oral statements of two Mussulmans of Kohat on the mind of two of our greatest an best national workers one of whom considers it, and rightly, an honour to work as a soldier under the general guidance of the other. These impressions they have honestly set down in writing, and for the reason that Mahatma Gandhi has stated in *Young India* of 26th March, he has published these statements for the perusal of his country The Mahatma states that 'the Hindus had their written and printed statements to which they had nothing to add, and that 'of the Mussulmans, Maulvi Ahmed Gul and Pir Sahib Kamal were the principal parties whose evidence we took.' He also adds that 'the Muslim Working Committee which is functioning in Kohat did not and would not come.' From this it is clear that Hindu witnesses were not examined at all, and that their written and printed statements were not subjected to the usual tests employed for ascertaining the value of evidence. Maulana Shaukat Ali writes that 'the Hindu case was complete and very carefully prepared. They have a large number of well-educated men at Kohat, including several barristers and pleaders. Besides, they had the advantage of the support and advice of many other prominent and able men in the Hindu community.' Whatever opinion one may hold of the refusal of the members of the Muslim Working Committee which was functioning at Kohat, and which was generally taking its cue from the officials, to send their representatives to Rawalpindi and enable the distinguished visitors who had gone there to make an enquiry and bring about reconciliation,—and we think they were criminally wrong in their refusal it is clear that it was not enough for the purpose of a proper enquiry to read the printed case of the Hindus and to examine the two Mussulmans who had gone to Rawalpindi.

With regard to the Muslim case Maulana Shaukat Ali states : 'The full Muslim case is not known. We had two sets of people before us—both Non-Co-operators at one time, but now in diffirent camps—inimical to each other, there was no collusion possible between them, and they had the advice of no Mussulmans from the outside. I am grateful these gentlemen came at my invitation. Like the other Government group—the so-called Muslim Representation Working Committee for Reconciliation—they could have declined. But they came and gave their evidence. There was very little material difference between the statements of Syed Pir Kamal Jeelani and Maulvi Ahmed Gul.' We have heard that the very same Hindus whose carefully prepared and printed case was never subjected to any cross-examination were badgering these Muslim witnesses at Rawalpindi, and that Maulana Shaukat Ali at whose invitation they had come to their rescue.

Be that as it may, the printed Hindu statement and the evidence of these two Mussulmans is poor material for coming to definite conclusions such as one needs in an affair of this importance and one for which on all accounts an enquiry was necessary. Mahatma Gandhi himself admits that 'it was difficult to come to any conclusions on details without a thorough examina-

tion on the spot and without examining many more witnesses. This, however, we could not do. We could not go to Kohat, nor was it our purpose to rake up the whole controversy again by going into minute details. Our purpose was to bring together the two parties if it was at all possible. We, therefore, confined ourselves to elucidating the main facts.' Maulana Shaukat Ali also says : 'Having made *such enquiries as were possible in the circumstances*, I have come to certain conclusions.' Speaking generally about places, where Hindus and Mussulmans have quarrelled or are quarrelling, he adds : 'Each side wants not peace but supporters for its cause. Mischief-makers on both sides are out to drag others down to their level. Enquiries after the event lead us nowhere. Cases are prepared carefully and our interference does no good. Each party puts all the blame on the other and will not accept any adverse judgment. In most cases the fault lies at the doors of both, and trying to weigh it or apportion it, besides being difficult-well-nigh impossible serves no good purpose. In fact, it further re-opens the question and both from the press and the platform the battle is fought over and over again.'

II

Now the long experience of mankind has convinced it that, although reality is known only to God, the only way in which man can discover the nearest approach to it is by adopting certain laws of evidence and rules of procedure. Even when these are followed, if more than one judge presides over a court there are occasionally differing judgments; and, in any case, the judgments of lower courts are often reversed in appeals, and occasionally the same courts modifies its judgment in a revision. But where the rules of evidence and procedure based on the age-old experience of mankind are not followed, no judgment can be expected to be satisfactory, much less to satisfy those against whom it is passed. In this connection it may be stated that on various occasions Government appointed Committees to enquire into the guilt of political detenues; but the Indian public was not satisfied, because, although the Committees were composed of men of considerable judicial experience, it was known that they would not be enquiring into the matters placed before them in the only manner in which they had been accustomed to take evidence and adjudicate on the matters before them. Their experience was an experience of a wholly different condition of things, and, far from being of much value in the changed conditions, was only likely to confuse them. The judicial experience in such cases was only meant to advertise the investigation of the Committees as excellent substitutes for judicial trials, which from the very nature of the case they could not be. We understand that judges of the High Court in Bengal refused to act as Commissioners under the Bengal Ordinance and to investigate the cases of those who were not to be tried even before the Commissioners, on the ground that this was

not the kind of investigation to which they were accustomed and in which their experience could be helpful, and that it was on this account that their refusal to participate in such investigations had to be accepted by Government.

As we have seen, the enquiry into the affairs of Kohat made by Mahatma Gandhi and Maulana Shaukat Ali has been as unlike a judicial enquiry as it was possible to be, and where the purpose was, in the words of Mahatma Gandhi himself, 'to bring together the two parties if it was at all possible,' and where it was considered essential not 'to rake up the whole controversy again,' nothing like a judicial verdict could have been expected, and it was only too likely that the two visitors to Rawalpindi should not reach identical conclusions. The only thing that was possible was for the two to receive individual impressions, and, although it is most unfortunate, it cannot be said that it was unexpected that these individual impressions should differ. As a matter of fact, we feel that it was the most likely thing to happen that only differing inferences should have been drawn from the wholly inadequate material that was placed before Mahatma Gandhi and Maulana Shaukat Ali.

Whether the publication of such impressions and inferences was wise or not, is another question. Mahatma Gandhi himself shows that he had no settled conviction on this point before he published the two statements, for he says, 'I am not sure that the publication at this juncture of our statements of the tragedy can do any tangible good, except in so far as the fulfilment of a promise must do in any case.' Of those whom Mahatma Gandhi consulted at Delhi, Hakeem Ajmal Khan Sahib suggested that the statements should not be published, and Pandit Motilal Nehru supported this to an extent. But Mahatma Gandhi had, in all probability without previously consulting Maulana Shaukat Ali, already announced that he had prepared a statement embodying the conclusion at which he had arrived, and was sending it on to Maulana Shaukat Ali leaving him either to confirm his conclusions or to state his own. After this announcement the question of publishing the two statements or witholding them from publication became a choice of two evils; and it is difficult to say which of the two was the lesser evil. Mahatma Gandhi evidently came to the conclusion that the lesser evil was their publication, and there is much to be said for his choice. We know how efforts were made to exploit the statement which Mahatma Gandhi had first prepared in order to announce the reason for commencing his fast last September, but which he had subsequently of his own accord withheld from publication for very good reasons. In such cases a sort of mystery soon begins to wrap up the whole affair, and Dame Rumour becomes busy in inventing and exaggerating things. In the enveloping mist the smallest thing assumes large proportions, and the decision to avoid publicity comes very near defeating its own purpose.

In this case Mahatma Gandhi had another object also in view. As he says, 'he came to the conclusion that the public which had hitherto known

the Ali Brothers and him to be always in agreement about so many public things should know that they too might differ on some matters, but without suspecting each other of conscious bias or wilful perversion of facts, and without mutual affection being in any way affected.' He added, 'Our open acknowledgement of our differences will be an object lesson in mutual toleration.' Differences of opinion between public workers are bound to arise unless they surrender their judgment entirely to others, and such differences cannot remain hidden unless there is a suppression of opinion. Mahatmaji desires neither surrender of judgement nor suppression of opinion, and no one knows more than he how often Muslim leaders have refused to press their own views out of deference to him whom they have acknowledged to be their leader and chief, though he himself is far from liking such deference to be paid to his views, and, although he once himself asked to be made Dictator, he has a holy horror of dictating to anyone.

But Indian politics has been so thoroughly debased by politicians and journalists of a certain type, chiefly to be found in the Punjab, though far from being unknown in other provinces whose only idea of political co-operation is surrender of one's judgment to them and the suppression of every opinion differing from theirs. The vernacular press of the Punjab is with extremely rare exceptions nothing better than a sink or cess-pool, and it is due to it that Punjab has long been, in the picturesque phase of Mahatma Gandhi himself, the Gangotri of a Ganges of abuse, recrimination and discord. We know what the Hindu section of the vernacular press of the Punjab would write on so inviting a subject as the differences between the impressions formed of the Kohat affair by Mahatma Gandhi and Maulana Shaukat Ali. Their open acknowledgement of their differences was an object lesson in mutual toleration meant more for the Punjab than for any other province of India. But to all intents and purposes on that one province at least it has entirely been lost. The *Tribune* has been generally more restrained and has shown a greater sense of responsibility. But 'The Mahatma's Verdict', which is the title of its leading article in its issue of 29th March, has proved too much for its restraint and sense of responsibility, and the extent to which the publication of the statements in question has been an object lesson to this, the leading organ of Hindu opinion in the Punjab, is shown by the following passages in that article :

> As against these clear and definite findings on the part of Mahatma Gandhi regarding Muslim excesses and Mussulmans' responsibility, we have the whitewashing statement of Maulana Shaukat Ali in which not only is there not a word of genuine condemnation of the horrible misdeeds of the Mussulman mob, but there is much of which the one possible meaning could be to excuse them. .... The Maulana might have spared himself the trouble, because half-hearted condemnation like this can serve no earthly purpose. The Mahatma has acquitted Maulana Shaukat Ali of 'conscious bias' and 'wilful perversion of fact', and has

expressed the opinion that 'our open acknowledgement of differences will be an object-lesson in mutual toleration.' The public, which has nothing to do with the question whether Maulana Shaukat Ali has been actuated by conscious or unconscious bias, and whether he has wilfully perverted facts or shown an utter incapacity for handling the facts of a Hindu-Muslim dispute, finds in the existence of these radical differences between him and Mahatma Gandhi not an object-lesson in mutual toleration, but a most rude awakening. The Mahatma may not see it, but the failure of the Mussulman leaders associated with him to condemn the Kohat atrocities, in the first instance, and the self-revealing report submitted by the foremost among them now, are a severe blow to the great movement associated with his name, and a conclusive proof that the object with which he made the Khilafat cause his own has signally and conspicuously failed.

It is not possible for any Mussulman among the Nationalist, as the writer of this effusion no doubt counts himself, to write about Mahatma Gandhi and his statement in the manner in which this *Tribune* of the Hindus of the Punjab has written about Maulana Shaukat Ali and his statement; and among other Mussulmans too only one with the perverted mentality of the editor of the *Muslim Outlook* could match such writings. We do not know whether Mahatma Gandhi reads the Urdu papers of the Punjab owned and edited by Hindus, for without a perusal of them he would not be able to judge correctly the ultimate end of the 'object-lesson in mutual toleration' which he wanted to present. But even the sample we have given from the leading Hindu journal of the Punjab conducted in English will convince him that these revilers of his when he published his article on Hindu-Muslim tension from Juhu, and admirers of today are precisely what Maulana Shaukat Ali has called them. They do not want peace, but supporters for their cause. They want to drag others down to their own level, and, while eager to throw all the blame on others, are always unwilling to accept an adverse judgment. The object with which Mahatma Gandhi made the Khilafat cause his own has failed neither 'signally' nor 'conspicuously' nor in any other manner. What seems to have failed 'signally and conspicuously' is the object with which Mahatma Gandhi had gone to the Punjab when in the Martial Law days it was crawling on its belly and writing poems of Englishmen's praise with its nose on the ground.

We feared very much that, like everything else that emanates from the Punjab, the mischief caused by the publication of the two statements on Kohat would spread to other provinces also and that the Gangotri would swell in its onward course to the full Ganges. But let us acknowledge with gratefulness that Hindu newspapers of other provinces conducted in English have so far to our knowledge the distinction of the denouncing Muslim leaders because the impressions of one of them have differed from those of his Hindu friend and chief.

Rightly or wrongly the two statements have now been published, and the question is, what are we to do with them ? We have not only no idea of the psychological process by which the scanty evidence produced before the authors of these statements created different impressions on their minds, but unfortunately even that evidence is not before us. And we are in no better position than our readers, who have no doubt read these statements in the daily press, to form an opinion as to whose impressions are more in accordance with the evidence that was before them.

For instance, Mahatma Gandhi writes of Mr. Jiwandas that 'he did not import the pamphlet in order to irritate the Mussulmans.' Maulana Shaukat Ali states that 'it was specially printed for Jiwandas.' In the absence of any evidence before us, how are we to say whether a pamphlet, about the vile and irritating character of which there is no difference of opinion between Mahatma Gandhi and Maulana Shaukat Ali, was or was not imported by Jiwandas 'in order to irritate the Mussulmans' ? We do not also know whether there was any direct evidence that has reached us, that it was a local Hindu of considerable position and importance who himself drew the attention of the Mussulmans to the pamphlet. It was stated to us that he had a quarrel with Sirdar Makhan Singh over a Hindu girl. This girl was originally betrothed to his son who became a Christian in England, and she was subsequently married to Sirdar Makhan Singh's son. This we are told, enraged the man, and he brought the pamphlet to the notice of the Mussulmans to involve the Sirdar in a quarrel with them. If that is the case, it cannot be said that it was Maulvi Ahmed Gul who roused the Mussulmans to needless fury over an insignificant matter. In any case we do not know on what evidence Mahatma Gandhi exculpates Jiwandas. But even if Jiwandas had desire to irritate the Mussulmans, surely some other Hindu was responsible for the publication of a 'poem' which was obviously intended to insult and offend the Mussulmans.

III

Again Mahatma Gandhi states that 'the Hindu tried to avoid the court proceedings and to settle the matter amicably.' This is not so strange. We have not known any case in which the Northern India Hindus have clearly been the aggressors, and in which they have not 'tried to avoid the court proceedings and to settle the matter amicably.' We know of two such cases neither of which received the attention that other such case in which the Hindus are the chief sufferers receive from the Hindu Press. One occurred in a village in the district of Moradabad not far from the town of Bachhraon village where in October, 1923, the Hindus assaulted Mussulman villagers, who had come to buy and sell on market-day, after blocking the outlet from the market. The other is the more recent case of Pilibhit during the last Muhurram when Hindus fired upon the procession of Tazias from the

house of the leading Hindu of the locality. In both cases appeals were made to Muslim leaders for amicable settlements out of court and they did all that was possible. It is quite another story whether the court proceedings are likely to result adversely to the Mussulmans. In this case, however, it is stated that 'as soon as the matter was brought to the notice of the Sanatan Dharama Sabha, it sent a written apology to the Mussulmans for the offending poem and removed it from the unsold copies.' Mahatma Gandhi is of opinion that 'this might have satisfied the Mussulmans but it did not;' and in another place he states even more clearly that 'the Sabha made enough reparation by its apology; it was, however, held insufficient by the Mussulmans, and the Sanatan Sabha was compelled to make further reparation by the burning of the copies of the whole pamphlet including the portrait of Shri Krishna.' Maulana Shaukat Ali also states that 'an ordinary apology should have been sufficient for us, and there was no necessityof burning the book; but both the written letter of apology and the burning were considered insufficient by the Muslims of Kohat.' We wish the authors of the statements had given the evidence on which these statements were based. Had it been so, we would have known whether the letter of apology was a frank expression of genuine regret, and whether the pamphlet was offered by the Hindus themselves to be burnt as a further reparation. What we have been led to believe by statements in the press and other evidence is that it was the magistrate himself who caused the pamphlet to be burnt, evidently in exercise of magisterial authority, and without the consent of the Hindus, and, in fact, against their wishes.

As for the letter of apology, it does not appear to have been sent with any better grace. In the petition sent by the Acting Secretary of the Sanatan Dharma Sabha of Kohat to the Chief Commissioner at Peshawar on the very day that rioting broke out at Kohat, it is stated that the verses constitute 'an ordinary composition the type of which is usually found in the newspapers, pamphlets, tracts etc.' and that 'the Assistant Commissioner was approached by a few selfish parachas (traders of Kohat) and impressed that unless an expression of regret came from the Sanatan Dharma Sabha a big row would be picked up and a show of force would be made. At this the Assistant Commissioner obtained, fairly or unfairly, the expession of regret from the said Sabha....... The said poem must have been wrongly construed and translated by the authorities and the Muslims, otherwise, it is an ordinary type of poem intended for the spread of religion.' We do not know if this precious document was or was not before the authors of the two statements. It seems to us that it was not; for we cannot conceive that any person, much less Mahatma Gandhi, could accept an 'apology' of this character as 'enough reparation.' It is clearly insinuated that it was unfairly extorted from the Hindus by the Assistant Commissioner, and it is clear that the persons who call that miserable stuff 'an ordinary poem intended for the spread of religion' are not the people whose expression of regret can be accepted as genuine and

sincere. It was apparently nothing better than the expression of the desire to 'avoid Court proceedings'. We do not know whether the authors of the two statements were told what the present writer was told in September last soon after the riots by the Khilafat Deputation of peace-makers which included Sriyat Amir Chand Bamwal, that the leaders of Mussulmans at Kohat were not satisfied with the letter of apology because a letter sent like that was not the form of tendering an apology customary in the Frontier, and that a deputation of Hindus should have gone to meet the Muslim leaders to tender the apology of the Hindus. We are unable to adjudicate on the merits of the apology unless we have more evidence on the subject. But we have no hesitation in saying that the petition of the Acting Secretary of the Sanatan Dharma Sabha to the Chief Commissioner is against the assumption that an amenda honourable was made by the Hindus of Kohat as soon as the grievance of the Mussulmans came to their notice, and that the reparation made was such as should have satisfied the people of the Frontier, knowing as we do that they are quick to anger and hard to appease, and sedulously nurse their grievances. The Hindus cannot have it both ways. They cannot eat their cake and have it too. If the letter of apology had been unfairly extorted from them by the Assistant Commissioner, it was not a genuine and sincere expression of regret. The only person it could bind was the Assistant Commissioner, if he had extorted it as has been insinuated, for after having dictated it himself, he could not rightly consider it insufficient as a reparation. It could not, however, bind the Mussulmans as an admission of its sufficiency.

This is not to say that the Mussulmans were justified in setting fire to Hindu houses or in looting them, much less in damaging places of Hindu and Sikh worship or in breaking idols, which Mahatma Gandhi believes them to have done. Such acts deserve the severest condemnation of all right thinking men and no provocation, even of the same character, can justify them.

IV

We now come to the release of Jiwandas on the 8th September and the Muslim meeting that followed it that night. Mahatma Gandhi admits that it was an 'error of judgment to have released Jiwandas before the 11th', which was the date already fixed on which he was to be brought before the court. Maulana Shaukat Ali characterises this as something much worse, for he writes in this connection of 'the double-faced policy of the Deputy Commissioner who kept on promising the Muslims one thing and the Hindus another.' Here too we have not before us the evidence on which these two differing judgments have been formed. And if we offer our own opinion, it will be a judgment with perhaps even less evidence to base it on than Mahatma Gandhi and Maulana Shaukat Ali had before them.

As regards what followed at the subsequent meeting that night, Mahatma Gandhi's statement that 'reprisals against the Hindus were threatened' is a

conditional one, since he adds that 'the reprisals were threatened if the Deputy Commissioner did not listen to the demands' of the Mussulmans. Since the Mahatma states the Deputy Commissioner 'yielded to the demand and the elated crowd dispersed', there is a great force in Maulana Shaukat Ali's statement that 'there was no meaning now in starting a massacre of the Hindus', and his inference that instead of having been arranged on the night of the 8th, the firing and the burning on the 9th was quite accidental. Mahatma Gandhi has stated that 'messages were sent out to the neighbouring villages to join the assembly in the morning.' He does not, however, state whether this was an invitation to these villages to join 'a general attack or jihad against the Hindus on the 9th September.' But Maulana Shaukat Ali tells us that such was the Hindu theory, which he himself does not accept, and which both Syed Pir Kamal Jeelani and Maulvi Ahmed Gul denied. Mahatma Gandhi's statement is not equally clear on this point, but he says that 'the Hindu version is that.........the whole of the looting and burning was according to a pre-arranged plan and after pre-arranged signals', and that 'there is no direct evidence on the point, and I am unable to reach a definite conclusion.' This is unfortunate, because in the absence of direct evidence on the point the Hindus could have had no justification whatever for laying such a definite charge at the door of the Mussulmans. Since the plans were admittedly formed at 'an excited meeting at which fiery speeches were made', direct evidence on this point should easily have been forthcoming, and should have been produced, and if such evidence did not exist then the charge itself should have been withdrawn. Neither was done, and it is only natural that this should shake the credibility of those who carefully prepared and printed the Hindu case. We do not know to what extent Mahatma Gandhi was affected by the absence of direct evidence on so important a point, and in circumstances such as this it is difficult for us to judge between him and Maulana Shaukat Ali 'when there are differences in the degree of reliance they have placed upon the evidence given them by witnesses.'

Now we come to the occurrences of the 9th September when 'the elated crowd dispersed' after the Deputy Commissioner had 'yielded to the demands' of the Mussulmans. Mahatma Gandhi admits that 'there is a hot dispute as to what the crowd did after dispersal near the Town Hall.' He states that 'the Mussulman version is that the Hindus fired the first shot, killing a Mussulman boy and wounding another, that this infuriated the mob resulting in the burning and looting that took place that day.' The Hindu version is that 'the first shot was fired by the Mussulmans, that they, the Hindu, fired afterwards and in self-defence and', as we have already stated, 'that the whole of the looting and burning was according to a pre-arranged plan and pre-arranged signals.' We have also seen that according to the Mahatma 'there is no direct evidence on the point and he is unable to reach a definite conclusion.' What follows are not conclusions but inferences drawn either from evidence that is not before us, or merely impressions for which there is no

definite basis of evidence.

V

To the Mahatma 'who fired shot has not much significance for the purpose of the distribution of the blame.' We regret we cannot agree with him, nor do we think would many others. The Mahatma is unable to accept the Muslim contention that 'no damage would have occured if the Hindus had not fired the first shot.' In his opinion 'some damage was bound to be done whether the Hindus had fired or not.' And evidently he bases this opinion, at least partly, on the ground that 'it is certain to me that Sirdar Makhan Singh's suburban residence was burnt and its garden damaged by the crowd before the firing, no matter from which side it was begun.' We have not the evidence before us which enabled Mahatmaji to reach this certainty. The burning of Sirdar Makhan Singh's suburban residence and the damage done to its garden is no doubt 'some damage.' But to us it has little significance compared to the burning of houses and shops in the town, and since 'the distribution of the blame' is in reality the distribution of the blame for what happened in the town itself on the 9th and 10th, and not merely the distribution of the blame for burning the suburban residence and damaging the garden of a gentleman against whose son the Mussulmans were already incensed on account of his alleged kidnapping of a Mussulman woman, it is of far greater significance to know who fired first shot. Mahatmaji admits that 'there is no doubt that the Hindus did fire and kill or wound some Mussulmans at some stage or other.' He also states that 'Mussulman witnesses question Hindu deaths or even injury to Hindus on the 9th. I am, however, certain thet several Hindus died or were wounded on the 9th at the hands of the Mussulmans. It is difficult to give the total number.' Here again we have no evidence before us to decide one way or the other. Maulana Shaukat Ali states that 'the fighting on the first day, the 9th September, was fairly balanced and from all accounts it appears the Muslim casualties were as many as the Hindus casualties, if not more.' With regard to this too no evidence is before us, but what follows are inferences and impressions which have not the value of definite conclusions based on published evidence.

The Mahatma states :

> 'My opinion is that the crowd elated by its success dispersed itself in several directions and made hostile demonstration in front of the Hindu houses or shops. I should not be surprised if the Hindus who......... were already nervous and were expecting trouble took fright at the demonstration and fired in order to scare away the mob. But such an attitude of resistance would infuriate the Mussulmans who were unused to resistance on the part of the Hindus. For as Pir Kamal said, the Frontier Mussulmans regarded themselves as *Nayaks* (protectors) and the Hindus as *Hamsayas* (here meaning protected). The more, therefore, the Hindus showed resistance the greater became the fury of the mob......

.........No doubt if the Hindus had not defended themselves at all, or if they had not fired the first shot, assuming that they did, the Mussulman demonstration would have exhausted itself sooner. But such was not to be expected of the Hindus who were in possession of arms and knew more or less indifferently how to use them.'

As against these impressions and inferences we have those of Maulana Shaukat Ali. He does not accept, as we have seen, the Hindu theory of a pre-arranged *jihad* for which invitation had been sent, and says that 'the Frontier village Pathans know how to fight but are not anxious to lose their lives uselessly. If they really wanted to organise a massacre, broad day-light was not very suitable for it, nor a fixed day known to their opponents. They would have arranged a surprise.' This easily deducible conclusion has been characterised by a Hindu newspaper of the Punjab as a suggestion made by the Maulana to the tribesmen to organise the next massacre of Hindus as a surprise and during the night. But since we are prepared for anything from the Punjab we shall pass over it. On these facts and on his belief that the fighting on the 9th September was fairly balanced—and from all accounts the Muslim casualties appeared to be as many as those of the Hindus—he bases his refusal to accept the Hindu theory for which he says he has found 'not an iota of proof', and with regard to which Mahatma Gandhi also admits that 'there is no direct evidence.' He equally disbelieves the Muslim theory which to our knowledge was put before him at Delhi that the Hindus had prepared a sudden attack on the Mussulmans hoping to take them unawares while the Mussulmans were unarmed and in the open streets, and the Hindus were well armed and under cover, so that they could achieve a success against them in fighting, and then trust to the police and the troops to intervene in time and save them before matters grew worse, and finally leave matters to the arbitrament of the law courts where their legal acumen and wealth could be trusted to give them a victory. We are glad that 'the Muslims of Kohat frankly said that such a thing was not possible,' though the theory is far more plausible than the Hindu theory of a pre-arranged signal of three shots fired by Parachas, which are alleged to have killed one woman and wounded another, and which were to be followed by a general holocaust of Hindus and a bonfire of Hindu houses. Having refused to accept both the theories, Maulana Shaukat Ali is compelled like Mahatmaji to advance a theory of his own. He states :

'In my opinion the firing and the fighting of the 9th September was accidental and not pre-meditated. By the sudden release of Jiwandas on the 8th September the aggressive section of the Hindus in its elation must have openly cried over its victory over Muslims. Next morning when the Deputy Commissioner, realising the intensity of Muslim feeling and his mistake in releasing Jiwandas, ordered his re-arrest and the arrest of several other Sanatan Dharmi members, it was the turn of aggressive Muslims to give expression to their elation over their complete victory,

and on this the quarrel started....................The Deputy Commissioner accepted their demands in full—not only Jiwandas but several other Sanatan Dharmi members were ordered to be arrested. The crowd was jubilant and happy as it got what it wanted. The honour and prestige of its faith was in its estimation saved. There was no meaning now in starting a massacre of Hindus. My own firm conviction is that the firing and the burning of the 9th September was quite accidental. The gun-powder was there in heaps but the match was lighted accidentally resulting in a huge conflagration. Neither the Hindus nor the Mussulmans had any such intention, and the Mussulmans naturally could not want it after their signal victory.'

Our readers are as well able to decide for themselves as we are which of these two sets of impressions and inferences are likely to be nearer the reality. For our part we have been forced by the similar experience of several places where Hindu-Muslim affrays have taken place to form the presumption which is, of course, rebuttable that the Hindus are as a rule less eager to risk an open fight in the streets than to throw from such corners of vantage as upper stories or roofs of houses brick-bats and other missiles at their opponents making hostile demonstrations, and in this way manage to issue invitations to the latter either to break into these houses or to set fire to them.

Whether in this case the burning of houses was prompted by the shots alleged to have been fired from the house of Sirdar Makhan Singh, resulting, as we had heard last September from the Peshawar deputation, in the death of a Mussulman boy and another man, or whether it was the burning of the Sirdar's house that prompted the firing, depends entirely upon evidence which we have not before us; and in the absence of such evidence theories, no matter how plausible, are only theories and cannot help us in the distribution of blame.

We cannot certainly accept as if it was a fact the theory of the Mahatma that the firing of the first shot by the Hindus, assuming that they did it, 'was done in panic and in self-protection and therefore excusable, even if not justifiable, and that the reprisals taken were wholly unwarranted.' Maulana Shaukat Ali states that 'the ignorant and less educated Khans in the Frontier Province have a high regard for their dignity and position, and, though ruined through their own follies and mistakes, keep up an empty show. The more clever and better educated Hindu commands a position now, thanks to his thrift and business capacity. He has amassed a fortune, and at times shows it aggressively. The old relations between the two had been changing, and the Government officials, although they were taking special advantage of the situation to further emasculate and weaken the Muslim gentry. It was they who were regarded as a danger to the Government in the Province, and not the Hindus. It was the Muslim alone who started Non-Co-operation in Kohat and suffered for it.' If this is true, and it certainly seems so, it would be fairly plausible to suggest that it was a Hindu who fired the first shot to assert the

rights and dignity of his community that had newly risen in the scale and to announce, as it were, to the decadent khans that he no longer needed them as a *Nayak* or protector, specially with the British, who were using him as an equipoise against the power of the Khans, and that he was no longer a *Hamsaya* in the sense of being *Zersaya* (under the shelter or protection) of the Khans, but their true *Hamsaya* or neighbour the shadow of whose house fell as often on the Khan's house as the shadow of the Khan's house fell on his.

The fact is that nothing with regard to the fighting of the 9th is a fact unless it can be established by evidence taken in the manner prescribed by human experience and subjected to tests equally prescribed by human experience. Such evidence apparently does not exist, and we regret that circumstances have forced upon Mahatma Gandhi the publication of his impressions and those of Maulana Shaukat Ali which differ, and unfortunately differ in a manner which everyone knowing the state of the country could predict without much perspicacity would be exploited by large sections of the two contending communities in the Punjab.

VI

For the more significant fighting was that which occurred on the 9th September, but the most important factor thereof namely, who fired the shot, being still a matter of opinion and not an established fact, the distribution of blame has become almost impossible. The facts are that 29 Hindus and Sikhs are stated to have been killed on the two days, and the number of Mussulman lives lost practically all on the first day was 11. If some Hindus were killed on the first day, as Mahatma Gandhi is certain though the Muslim witnesses question it, the number of Hindus killed that day is not likely to have been even half their total number of killed. If we assume it to be about 9, then only the remaining 20 Hindus lost their lives on the second day. That is not such a very large number if as the Mahatma states, 'it is generally admitted that on the 10th September the Muslim fury knew no bounds.' Even assuming that practically all the 20 Hindu and Sikh lives were lost on the second day, the description of that day's fury does not seem to be a fitting one so far as the number of deaths is concerned.

By far the more important thing is, what part was taken in this boundless fury by the Mussulmans of Kohat and even by the 'tribesmen from all parts who stole into Kohat by making breaches in the walls and otherwise', when, in the words of Mahatma Gandhi, 'no doubt highly exaggerated reports of Mussulman deaths at Hindu hands had reached them.' The Mahatma admits that 'the Constabulary freely partook in the destruction of life and property' which was general, 'which was witnessed by the officials and which they could have prevented.' Now the Constabulary was no doubt largely Muslim. For all that we know it may have been exclusively so. But it was

just as much Muslim as the Pathans, the Baluch and the Punjabi Muslims who fought for the Christian British against the Khalifa of the Prophet of Islam for the conquest of the Holy Places of Islam. It was as much Muslim as the Gurkhas, whom Bengal and Assam and some other places too know only too well, are Hindus. The Mahatma has himself characterised them not as men but as pieces of the fighting machinery of the British. We think the Mahatma should have tried to apportion the blame between this official machinery and the Mussulman inhabitants of Kohat. It is not enough to say, as he does, that 'had not the Hindus been withdrawn from these places and taken to the cantonment not many could have lived.' How does this help us when he himself admits that the officials were the witness of a general destruction of life and property in which their constabulary freely partook, and which they could have prevented ? If the Hindus could be withdrawn from their places *after* this general destruction of life and property and taken to the cantonment they could have been withdrawn even *before* this destruction or better still, the destructive constabulary itself could have been withdrawn or ordered to be less destructive and more protective.

The Mahatma says he does not believe that the Mussulmans have suffered in any way proportionate to the Hindus. In all probability he has sufficient evidence of this before him which we have not before us. But this was only natural, considering that they were small in numbers, more wealthy, and were attacked on the second day not only by the Mussulmans of Kohat and the neighbouring tribesmen infuriated by the Muslim loss of life on the first day, but also by the Constabulary that should have protected them. We have heard that in firing from their *morchas* the Hindus did not spare the Constabulary, or, at any rate, it too suffered in the indiscriminate and uncontrolled Hindu firing. But this is only hearsay evidence and of little value. Whether it was after suffering at Hindu hands that the Constabulary became furious, or its fury was wanton and unprovoked, there is little doubt that far the greater fury that knew no bounds was that of the better armed Constabulary than of the proportion in which these latter suffered at Hindu hands and the Hindus at their hands.

The Mussulmans are to blame because it is *cowardly* to wreak such vengeance on a much smaller community among whose characteristics courage is not very prominent, even though it may be assumed that they offered provocation both by publishing the notorious pamphlet and by firing the first shot and drawing the first blood. The Mussulmans of the Frontier Province are notorious for being, as we have said, quick to anger, hard to appease and given to the nursing of grievances. These detract a great deal from their bravery, and in the interest of Islam itself these characteristics of theirs which made such a tragic exhibition at Kohat must be condemned. More still is to be condemned, if it is true, that 'even some Khilafat volunteers, whose duty it was to protect Hindus and regard them as their own kith and kin, neglected their duty and not only joined in the loot, but also took part in the previous

incitement. For this we shall require some proof, but we have no hesitation in saying that everything that the Hindus did at Kohat should have been forgiven to them for all that one man alone among the Hindus, namely Mahatma Gandhi, did for the Khilafat cause. And it must be remembered he was not alone.' It was the realisation of this fact perhaps more than all others that led Mahatma Gandhi to think that he owed a penance in the shape of a fast to the Hindus who had suffered at Kohat at the hands of those whom he had befriended along with many others in their hour of need. It is this rather than the gibes of a section of the Hindu Press that makes us hold our head down in shame; and if one man's penance could purge another, it is we who should have undertaken the 21 days' fast rather than Mahatma Gandhi.

Source : The Comrade, April 1925.

3

BEST MEMORIAL TO BI-AMMAN

BI-AMMAN before she left us for good told us to look upon our only sister as our mother in her place. Every desire of Bi-Amman was a command to us, and the first thing we did when we returned home after burying her was to go straight to our sister and put our heads at her feet and kiss them in acknowledging her as the Queen of ourselves and of our house-holds. On her behalf and on our own we desire to thank all our dear friends and co-workers for the kind and consoling messages they have sent us from all parts of India and outside, too,—Hindus, Mussulmans, Parsis, Sikhs, Jains, and Christians, all joining in paying homage to and heaping honours on a brave departed soldier of India who laid down her life while fighting for God and country. Friends would excuse us if we cannot acknowledge all the loving messages separately. The work before us is so heavy and difficult that we have no time left for mourning or private sorrows.—(While preparations for the funeral were going on and Bi-Amman's body was lying in the house, one of us who had been up the whole night was writing a leading article and correcting proofs; and perhaps this act of a devoted son has pleased her departed soul far more than any crying and lamentations). She repeatedly and earnesty prayed to God to give her a few more years so that with her own eyes she might see Swaraj established in India. She used to say she was six years old when she saw a change—India's Raj passing into foreign hands;

she desired to see another change before she died—India's Raj coming back into Indian hands and this time a real, People's Raj. God in His inscrutable wisdom knows what is best for us, and everything HE does is for our good. So we cheerfully submit. But before we carried her body to the Jame Masjid for prayers and burial, we, her children and grandchildren, took a solemn oath invoking God's aid that we would all try to walk in her footsteps and do our utmost to realise her dream as early as possible.

While we cannot separately acknowledge the many messages and letters we have received, we think it our duty to publicly acknowledge the following letter written in Urdu and received from a Hindu sister in the Punjab which has touched our hearts and cheered us a great deal. This is what she writes : '*Namaskar*, I do not know how to express the reason of my writing this letter. In the Conference that part of your speech in which you made mention of our Bi-Amman was most heart-gripping. Hardly was there an eye that did not shed a tear for that beloved lady. I became devoted to her from the first day of her *darshan*. I know such souls come to this world at great intervals, and so far I have not set my eyes on her equal. I cannot find words to express the sorrow her death caused me. Yes, she was aged-old. But poor India needed her badly. That is why her death is more painful than of many a younger woman. I do not know who will fill her place. I would have liked all the women of India to have met together to mourn her loss, but the conditions of the country is not favourable. The story of such a good and true woman ought to be written in letters of gold and sent broadcast to every village in India so that every woman and girl may try to walk in her footsteps. I pray to *Ishwar* that He will give me guidance to follow her example. It is my great desire that her memory be kept green in some form. I wanted to lay some flowers of my *shraddha* (faith) and *bhakti* (devotion) on her grave and to lay them with my own hands too; but that is not possible just now. God willing when I come to Delhi next I will satisfy my heart's desire. I will go in the body to her grave and put a *teeka* of that sacred earth on my forehead. In the meantime I am sending a humble sum of Rs. 10. Kindly get Rs. 5 worth of the best flowers procurable, and lay them on my behalf on her grave, and with the rest buy and distribute sweets or fruits to poor children in her name. *Parmatma* knows how my heart is filled with thoughts of her and how many times daily I think of her. For us such valuable lives are so rare, and even these few are being snatched away from us. This is the misfortune of poor India. In any case we have to bow our heads before *Parmatma*. This is a private letter. I was a silent devotee of hers then, and so am I now, and so will I always remain. I am niether used to demonstration, nor desire it; so it is not at all necessary to mention this to any outsider, nor is it permitted.'

We fear we had to disregard her desire in this matter to some extent; but we withhold her name. This letter to us from the Punjab is a happy augury of the glorious future that we desire.

The best memorial to Bi-Amman will be if all India's brave sons and daughters sink their petty differences and unite to win freedom for our unhappy land.

Source : The Comrade, December 1924.

4

NATIONAL MUSLIM EDUCATION : VIEWS OF MOHAMMAD ALI

I

The *Comrade* when it was first founded was intimately associated not only with Muslim politics, but also with Muslim education, and, in fact, it set out to discuss everything that was connected with the progress of Indians in general and of the Mussulmans in particular. To-day also the *Comrade* has the same purpose in view, and if the universalisation of the Charkha is the immediate national need of today, it is not to be gain-said that ultimately the greatest need of the Muslim community is national education, and the *Comrade* must not neglect it any longer. It has been sadly neglected by all Indian communities, and it did not take one long to realise this during the consultations that took place at Belgaum between those that were particularly interested in it. But since the Mussulmans were the first to rebel, under Sir Syed Ahmed Khan fifty years ago, to rebel against official control of education and the first to raise the banner of non-co-operation in education, it is their duty to be the first in re-examining also the present situation of national education.

Let us, however, make one thing clear. Although all communities in India must equally give such a direction to the education of their youths as would entitle it to be called national, and national education must be of a type distinct from that which is affected in the government or added institutions, each community must provide separately for the education of its youth, without, however, setting up religious tests, or excluding members or other communities, or imposing upon them compulsory religious instructions in the tenets of its faith. This must be so because each community has its own ideals and its own traditions, and it is possible to provide for the proper training of a community's youths according to these ideals and traditions unless it is done in institutions mainly intended for its own youth.

Taking, therefore, the need of communal education for granted, we desire our readers to concentrate their attention on the peculiar needs of the Muslim community. To our mind the greatest need of Mussulmans is that

they should be Mussulmans in the true sense of the word, and for that purpose it is essential that we should not tolerate the lacerating distinction between temporal and spiritual things, nor encourage any differentiation of species among the Mussulmans such as the clergy and the laity. Experts there will always be of religious as well as of secular learning; but it is not permissible in Islam for any individual, let alone large masses of people, to remain ignorant of the essentials of Islam, while a particular section of Mussulmans devotes all its time to religious studies and remains ignorant of everything else. If this state of things continues unchanged, and the process remains unchecked, the small body of Muslim Ulema and the great mass of Mussulmans outside this small circles will soon come to approximate to the clergy and the laity in other communities. Our decline is largely due to this departure from Islam as preached and practised in its earliest days, Islam without latter-day accretions and in all its pristine purity.

When the students of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan's College at Aligarh in October 1920 resolved to respond to the call of Non-co-operation, and when, on the refusal of the college authorities to free the college from official control, they converted themselves into a Non-cooperation university, an opportunity was presented to those interested in Muslim education on truly Islamic and national lines to frame a scheme of studies for national Muslim educational institutions in India. Before the task of devising a course of studies could be undertaken, special attention had to be paid to the main facts of the existing situation of the Mussulmans in India. The evils from which Muslim society in this country was suffering had to be clearly understood, and remedies had to be devised, therefore, and incorporated in a scheme of studies. The goal that was always kept in view was to turn out from these educational institutions not only young men of culture according to modern standards, but true Mussulmans imbued with the spirit of Islam, and possessing enough knowledge of their religion to be able to stand by themselves as sufficiently independently independent in the army of Islam's missionaries. It was felt that even cultured Muslims possessed so little knowledge of their faith that they were content to leave the entire subject of religion exclusively to the samll circle of Ulema, and either neglect it themselves and make it no part of their own lives, or live in blind and unreasoning dependence on the dictation of one or more guides from this group of Ulema. This was neither good for themselves nor for the Ulema, nor yet for Islam.

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan was an ultra-loyalist and an arch-heretic according to some people, and yet it was this ultra-loyalist that had raised the standard of revolt against the Government in education, and it was this arch-heretic who had based his dissent on no other ground than a Muslim's passionate attachment to his faith. Christian missionary colleges and schools in which non-Christian students were compelled to attend the Bible classes were, of course, *anathema maranatha* to the Muslims. But Syed Ahmed Khan had

no less aversion to the schools and colleges of a religiously neutral Government, and he attributed the backwardness of his co-religionists, in Western education to their sound instincts and the cherished traditions of their past which would not tolerate a complete divorce between secular and religious education. It was this policy that the Government had felt itself compelled to pursue, and it was precisely this policy which made the Mussulmans keep aloof from its educational institutions. Syed Ahmed Khan not only correctly explained, but vigorously justified this attitude of his co-religionists. But he was too practical a reformer to be content with railing at the evil without working at the same time for the good. He prepared a scheme of a University which was to provide for the youths of his own community religious as well as secular instruction. Above all it was to create for young Mussulmans a centre with the true Islamic atmosphere so that its *alumni* would not merely be educated and cultured men, but educated and cultured Mussulmans. We are not concerned with many of his religious views, and it may as well be confessed that having come under the spell of Western science at a time when Europe had received a new secular evangel in Darwin's *Origin of Species* and the revolutionizing theory of evolution, and having been impressed so greatly by the progressiveness of Europe Sir Syed Ahmed Khan in his newly-awakened enthusiasm attributed to it an omniscience that even in the light of its marvellous developments must now be confessed to have been greatly exaggerated. With a Tacitus-like antithesis he had credited Europe with very good quality in which he had found his own people deficient; but for all this he never wavered for a moment in his belief in the eternal truth of Islam and in the capacity of the Muslims to rise to the highest pinnacle of human greatness. All that he wanted was to build a bridge that would connect his ancient faith with this new science, and the ideal that he placed before himself when framing his scheme of the Muslim University of the future is best expressed in his own words. 'Science', he said, 'shall be in our right hand, and philosophy, in our left, and on our head shall be the crown of 'there is no God but Allah and Mohamed is his Apostle'. Aligarh did produce a fine amalgam of the East and the West in many things; and in spite of its progress in Western science and literature, it maintained the communal pride that often acted as an effective motive to right conduct on the part of its *almuni*. But, it must be confessed that it furnished them with precious little equipment in the matter of their knowledge of their faith. They were progressive enough, and they were proud enough of their faith; but they were, alas, far too ignorant of it, and their pride in it did not therefore help them much. In order to avoid repelling Muslim parents whose orthodoxy was shocked by the militant rationalism of Sir Syed, and to attract their boys, he had passed a sort of Self Denying Ordinance that not only his own religious books would not be taught in his college, but that he would not be a member of the Committee that regulated religious instruction. In this way a very colourless and really moribund Committee which never did any work prescribed, perhape once

all, some very elementary text-books in what was euphemistically called 'Theology'. These text-books for the most part only prescribed rules for ceremonial cleanliness and contained the ritual of prayers, or provided for the senior students some of the principal laws of Islam regulating to marriages, dowry and divorce. The Quran practically remained a closed book to the students, except for the lectures of the late Maulana Shibli, which were however discontinued. The traditions of the Prophet, too, were no more than a name; while only for a time some of the college classes read what should be called a 'Primer' dealing with the life of the Prophet, written by Maulana Shibli which did not extend beyond a score of pages in size. Of 'Theology' in the sense of Dogmatics or Dialectics, there was no trace in any text-book. Ill-paid and neglected drones are generally employed in colleges and schools for teaching Arabic and Persian which were degraded to the position of 'Second Language'. And it was such dull drones that were pitch-forked at Aligarh into the 'Faculty of Theology' to teach his religion to the Muslim youth once a week in the hour consecrated on other days to 'Second Language'. The result was that the 'Theory Hour' was even more enjoyable than the 'Recreation Hour'. What little information the text-book furnished could be crammed over night and squirted out on the 'Answer Book' in the examination hall next morning once or twice a year. There was no doubt a communal consciousness among the students, but it was far more secular than religious; and although they considered Islam to be the final message for mankind and the only entirely true faith, and they could strenuously, and even intelligently enough, argue about the superiority of its chief tenets, they were shamefully ignorant of the details of its teachings and of its world-wide and centuries-old history.

It was this state of affairs which the organisers of the Jamia Millia Islamia, or the National Muslim University of Aligarh set out to reform. For this purpose an intimate knowledge of the Holy Quran was considered an indispensible foundation. Therefore at every stage provision was made for an intelligent study of the word of God, so that even those members of Muslim society who, for various reason economic and other, were not able to continue their studies beyond the primary stage, should have read the Holy Quran, not only in the original Arabic, but also in the inter-linear Urdu or other vernacular translation thereof. More than this, they insisted on the acquisition of some knowledge of the Arabic language even in the Primary stage of education, it being laid down, however, that a radical change must be made in teaching it. The present method of teaching, in which grammar obtrudes itself too much up the beginner's attention, has to be entirely discarded, and a more direct and natural method must be adopted if young children can be expected to acquire such knowledge of the Arabic language as can be of practical use to them in understanding the Holy Quran.

The proposed plan was that soon after a child became familiar with the Arabic and Urdu characters, he should be taught the last few short chapters

of the Quran not only in Arabic, but also in their Urdu or other vernacular translation, and that the prayers contained in *Namaz* should be taught in the same manner, so that even a child of seven would not offer his prayers without understanding what he was repeating. Similarly, it was proposed that by the time a child finished his primary education approximately at the age of 12 or 13, and finished *Quran-i-Shareef* in Arabic, he should also have finished its inter-linear Urdu or other vernacular translation. This meant that he would not only finish at the age the *Nazira* reading of the Quran, as at present, but also the *Nazira* reading of a fairly large-sized Urdu or other vernacular book which, however, would happen to be the translation of the Holy Quran.

But at this stage, as has already been stated, this much only was not considered to be enough. It was therefore proposed that in the last three years of the primary stage a boy should be taught Arabic as he is often taught English at present. It is true that even with improved methods of teaching a child of ten is not likely to acquire in three years more than a very elementary knowledge of a foreign language. But it was hoped that, in addition to his elementary knowledge of Arabic, his reading of the Quran and its translation side by side for full five years or more would unable him to pick up at least so much of Arabic and would create in him an interest and fervour in reading his Scriptures with the assistance of the inter-linear translation. It is this interest and fervour that was sought to be created, and it was feared that it could not be done by any method other than the one proposed in the scheme under reference.

In the secondary stage, which was to include as much education as is generally imparted in the Intermediate classes of present-day Colleges, the study of Arabic was made compulsory with the same object in view; and therefore it was proposed that in these five years, ending with the 17th year of a young man's life, the students should be taught the entire *Quran-i-Shareef* as the only text-book of Arabic, together with a number of select *Hadises*, and that at the same time they should learn Arabic as a living language so as to be able to speak and write it at least like Intermediate students speaking and writing English at present. It was proposed that only so much grammar as was absolutely necessary should be taught, and that the method of teaching it should be reversed, the student being made to deduce the rules of grammar inductively from several examples of the correct use of the Arabic language, rather than deductively to form correct sentences after first mastering the rules of grammar.

At this stage it was not proposed to teach any other Arabic prose as, in the first place, the object was not so much the study of the language as attainment of an intimate knowledge of the *Quran-i-Shareef*; and, in the place, a study of the Quran was thought ample at this stage even for the acquisition of a knowledge of the Language. Nevertheless it was proposed that a few hundred select verses should also be taught to familiarise the student with

Arabic poetry.

It was hoped that such a study of the Quran as was proposed would make a young man a far better Mussulman, and would enable him to know his religion far more intimately than the study of Theology through other text-books; but it was not intended that other knowledge of Muslim Theology should not be imparted.

What was proposed in the Primary stage was, firstly, practical instruction in Islamic ritual imparted orally by the teacher; and, secondly, instruction by means of lessons with regard to the beliefs and commandments of Islam to be incorporated in the vernacular 'Readers' which would include other instruction also, such as instruction in Islamic history and elementary scientific information embodied in a popular form.

It was proposed to teach *Aqaid*, *Fiqh* relating to *Ibadat*, *Akhlaq* and *Seerat* in this manner, so that they could be easily assimilated by a growing child at an early stage. The religious instruction generally imparted at present seldom goes beyond elementary *Fiqh* relating to *Ibadat*, and that too is imparted in a manner which kills all interest for it in the student, and makes it a drudgery. Instead of that, it was proposed that lessons in the Urdu Readers should be skilfully prepared with requisite literary grace, so that they could unobtrusively and almost imperceptibly familiarise a Muslim child with correct Muslim beliefs and with the main commandments of his faith, preferably with a short history of these commandments in order to explain their gradual development, and thus impress on the student their special need. These lessons were also to incorporate leading incidents from the *Seerat* of the Prophet and of his immediate successors, and from Islamic history, not only with a view, to impart necessary and correct information on these subjects, but also with a view to impress upon the mind of a child that it was because of the soundness of Islamic beliefs, the practical utility of Islamic commandments, and strict adherence to them in practice, that Mussulmans achieved their early successes, and that if we desire to retrieve our lost pre-eminence, it could only be done by adherence to Islamic convictions, and following the example of our Prophet and his immediate successors.

In the Secondary stage, and also in the University stage, *Fiqh*, *Aqaid* and *Seerat* were proposed to be taught as distinct subjects and not merely in the Urdu Readers. But the lectures were to be oral, and it was proposed that, as far as possible, text-books should be avoided. Text-books were to be generally for the guidance of the teacher himself, so that the present day stagnation might be remedied, and reliance on the original sources of authority rather than on latter-day compilations might be encouraged.

It would be manifest from all that has gone above that a much greater emphasis was being laid on religious teaching than had ever been attempted in any national institution where secular instruction is also imparted. But it was hoped that the method suggested would be an improvement upon that which was pursued for religious instruction even in institutions solely devoted

to the study of Theology. In the University stage, provision had been made for a School of Islamic Studies, in which a young Mussulman, who had acquired as much secular knowledge as is now obtainable in Colleges teaching up to the Intermediate standard, could pursue a study of *Tafsir*, *Hadis* and *Fiqh*, with the *Usool* of each of these, of *Aqaid* and *Kalam* and of *Seerat*, and the History of Islam with requisite study of Geography, and at the end of this course, at the age of twenty or thereabouts, could be considered qualified to be a religious teacher or Maulvi, and at the same time be acknowledged to possess as much culture in the modern sense of the word as any graduate of any European University. He could proceed thereafter to a Doctorate, for which a thesis on any subject in ded in any of the main heads of religious knowledge detailed above was to be required. This would, it was thought, for the first time bring under one roof secular and religious learning with undoubted benefit to both, and remove that estrangement between the two which had resulted in sterlising religious learning and making secular learning soulless and godless.

II

Last week we discussed one feature of the Jamia Millia Islamia of Aligarh and to-day we propose to discuss other. But even if the Jamia's scheme of religious studies along with secular instruction was to be its only departure, we ask educated and cultured Mussulmans, and the Ulema too, to say whether a university that intended to teach all this had still to justify its existence. We ask this question not in an academic sort of way, but we *demand* that if this scheme of studies is of any value to Indian Mussulmans, they should not merely tell us that they *like* it, but *prove* their liking for it by such a substantial help of the Jamia as would ensure its permanent existence even independently of the contributions from the Khilafat Fund. To our mind this form of education must now take precedence over all other existing forms. But even if the Mussulmans are not prepared to go so far as to substitute this scheme of education for the existing schemes, we still ask whether a community of seventy million Mussulmans cannot provide even 700 students to pursue the course of studies that we have outlined and the funds to enable them to do so. That is why we ask the Muslim public whether it approves of this scheme of studies or not and the answer if favourable must be more students, more scholarships and more books for the library, and not merely a tribute of praise in words.

Next to the religious aspect of education, on which much greater stress has now been laid than ever before, it is to be emphasised the thing, that is, that the absurd and slavish idea of imparting instruction in the various branches of knowledge through the refractory medium of a foreign language must be wholly discarded. The study of English is to be retained as an optional subject in the secondary stage, and it is desirable that for some time

to come a large number of school students should continue to learn that language from the age of thirteen. But it must be entirely removed from the Primary stage, and in no case must it be the medium of instruction, though it may for some time be necessary to retain European terminology in the case of certain branches of Science.

Permission, must, however, be given to school students in the Secondary stage to study *any* European language, and it is hoped that in course of time other European languages, like French and German would also be taught side by side with English in these Secondary schools.

But the study of Asiatic languages is not to be neglected. In the first place the study of the vernaculars, and of Hindi where Urdu is the vernacular, and of Urdu where Urdu is not the vernacular, must be compulsory in the Primary and Secondary stages; and provision must also be made for a degree in the vernacular, though in view of the relative strength of the vernaculars at present, and of our present need, for some time to come the degree should be awarded in the vernaculars only as the reward of authorship in the vernacular in any subject approved by the University. This would encourage the preparation of new books which are greatly in demand, among others, for educational purposes.

Apart from the compulsory study of the vernaculars, and the use of the vernaculars as the medium of instruction in every stage, provision must be made for the study of an Asiatic language other than one's own vernacular, as an optional subject in schools. In the University stage provision must be made for degree in Arabic, Persian (both Language and Literature) and as the reward of merely *linguistic* attainments in any two oriental languages other than Arabic, Persian and, of course, one's own vernacular.

Since a foreign language is to be discarded as the medium of instruction, it is confidently expected that the students would both attain deeper knowledge and cover a larger surface of it in the same number of years that they do at present in the existing schools and colleges. Thus, a student who has completed the primary school course should be expected to be sufficiently well-grounded in the main essentials of Muslim Theology (which would in itself be of very considerable cultural value, when taught in the manner proposed, as a subject of the greatest practical utility in *this* world also); to know a little of Arabic so as to be able to read the Holy Quran with a relish and fervour; to know Arithmetic for all practical purposes of life, and elementary practical Geometry and Mensuration, together with elementary Book-keeping, which would help a village boy in his ordinary dealings in after-life; to possess accurate and extended general information, although of an elementary character with regard to various sciences; to be acquainted with the outlines of the history of Islam and of India in their relationship with world movements; with the Geography of India in considerable detail and the Geography of Islamic countries generally, in relationship with the rest of the world; with the outlines of the Constitution of his country's Government

and of the administration of his district; and to know generally his rights and duties as a citizen. At the end of this stage he should be able to read and write his vernacular with ease and should not altogether be at the mercy of the professional scribe for purposes of petition-writing or of understanding the contents of such documents as he is ordinarily required to sign.

In the secondary stage he should be expected to be familiar with the teaching of his faith, and to possess intimate knowledge of the Quran in Arabic, to read and appreciate the literature in his vernacular, and write it with lucidity and a degree of literary grace, and to be able to read easy Persian and Hindi if the vernacular is Urdu, or read and write Urdu, with ease if the Vernacular is other than Urdu, and to have knowledge at least up to the present Intermediate standard of any three of the following subjects :

Any European language, or any Asiatic language other than the vernacular, History of (India and Islam, and one more historical subject); Geography, Civics and Political Science, Economics, Natural Science (*any three* branches), Mathematics, Logic and Elementary Psychology, and Drawing.

In the University stage, besides acquiring a further knowledge of his religion, and acquainting himself with standard works of Theology, he should be required to take up any one branch or school of studies, such as Islamic studies, History, Sociology, Philosophy, Mathematics, Science, Literature or Law, and to show therein proficiency up to the standard of the B.A., degree of European Universities or of the M.A. degree of the present Indian Universities.

It may also be explained that considerable modification must be made in the present division of the various stages of education. It is not expected that many children in villages, or belonging to the poorer classes in towns, would ordinarily proceed with their education after they have completed their twelfth year of age. And for a long time to come, for at least 75% of the population, whatever instruction is to be given to them, must be a complete unit in itself, though we should not set up any barrier for those who would proceed to the next stage of education. And since this age also corresponds with the natural change from childhood into youth, it should be a natural landmark in education as well. For the same reason the method of imparting instruction too should be different at this stage from the method to be adopted in the next stage. Here no division is made between knowledge of one subject and knowledge of another, and except Arithmetic, which cannot be taught in that manner, the idea is to teach every subject by means of reading lessons, to be supplemented by oral instruction intended to bring home to the child the knowledge and the moral teaching contained in the daily lessons of the 'Reader'.

Such 'Reader' will have to be prepared, and it is proposed that under the Chief Editorship of a competent educationist with an intimate knowledge of child psychology, and a considerable sense of literary style, a number of writers should be appointed for this purpose. *This is a task which alone*

entitles those who would undertake it to the liberal patronage of the entire community. The essential general qualifications for each of these writers should be the same as for the Chief Editor himself. But some will have to be those who specialise in Science; while others will have to be religious teachers; and a third set will have to be students of Islamic and Indian History and a fourth students of literature, and so on. The various subjects to be included in these 'Readers' should be allotted to the groups concerned, and the Chief Editor should, in consultation with them, fix the size of each 'Reader', and the number of lessons for each, and allot to each subject the lessons thereon in each 'Reader'. In this way the entire ground of knowledge to be imparted to students in the primary stage should be covered by the different groups of writers in graduated lessons, and the 'Readers' should not be used merely to impart instruction in the vernacular but also to convey wide and accurate information which is the minimum necessary for a human being to possess and which it is possible for a child of 12 to assimilate. The child should, therefore, be examined not merely in reading the vernacular text book, but also in its contents and subject-matter, including religion, science, history, geography, civics, etc.

The next stage would be that of Secondary education, corresponding not to the present High School stage, but to the Intermediate Collegiate stage, to be finished, like the Primary stage, in 5 years, and approximately when the student has completed the 17th year of his age. In this stage the vernacular course should be intended to impart instruction merely in the vernacular language and literature. The other subjects should be taught as so many distinct subjects, and the 'Reader' system of general instruction should be discarded here. It is intended that in the first three years, which would correspond to the present Matriculation standard, a youth should take up any *three* subjects, in addition to the vernacular, Arabic and Theology. But in the final two years corresponding to the Intermediate, he should be required to take up only *two* optional subjects. It is not necessary to restrict his choice as much as is done at present. He should therefore be able to select only subjects for which he has a real aptitude. But apart from the opportunity accorded to him at this stage of selecting his own group of subjects, specialisation should not begin until he has reached the University stage.

In the Primary stage he should have gathered necessary information on every important subject, though necessarily of an elementary character. But he should still have got enough of it to what his appetite for more knowledge on the subjects for which he has a natural aptitude, and to know that there are besides those that he selects for his own study, various other distinct branches of knowledge on the subjects for which he has a natural apt tude, and to know that there are besides those that he selects for his own study, various other distinct branches of knowledge, requiring long and careful study if practical use is to be made of them. Thus the larger choice that is to be

given to him in the Secondary stage should not mean his complete ignorance of any subject, and yet more extended knowledge of those subjects for which he has a natural aptitude.

In the University stage the 'Group' system should be discarded altogether, or rather the grouping together of the subjects should be regulated under different 'Schools' or branches of knowledge, such as History, Philosophy, Mathematics, Science, Literature, Law, Sociology, and of course, Islamic Studies. In exceptional cases permission might be accorded to a student to attend lectures, some in one school and some in another, and a diploma may be given at the end of his special course setting forth the subjects he has thus studied to the satisfaction of the teachers and examiners. But on the whole it is desirable that this system should be discourged, and a Pass degree should be a rare thing and not the rule as in the Indian universities to-day.

The method of imparting instruction in the University stage must also differ from the system of teaching in the Secondary stage. Unlike the school, there should be no teaching from text-books here, but a system of lectures in which the student should be taking down notes as the profession proceeds with his lecture, supplemented by a tutorial system in which the tutor should guide and regulate the private studies of the undergraduate, and offer suggestions rather than sit down, text-book in hand, to read and explain the text. That is why the present Intermediate stage has been included in the Secondary stage to which it is far more nearly allied.

It has been already stated that approximately 7% of the population would not for some time to come proceed beyond the primary stage, as far as can be foreseen at present, and no more than 5%, even if as many, would proceed beyond the secondary stage, which must therefore be a distinct and a definite unit like primary education, without any artificial barrier being set up here either. After completing 17 years of age, a young man who has completed the school course (which should correspond to the present Intermediate standard) should be expected to rank as a man of culture, at least of the same standard as Public School men in England, and therefore fit to take part in life as a man of culture even if he proceeds no further. Those who have literary ambitions and the requisite leisure, or desire to pursue a literary vocation, would proceed to the University stage. This should occupy another three years of a young man's life, and he should generally graduate when he has completed the age of 20. But graduation means not the attainment of the standard of the present Indian B.A. Degree, but of the Honours B.A. of English Universities, or the present Indian M.A. degree. The Doctorate provides for still higher education, research and authorship, and it ought to be possible to obtain that at the age of 22 or 23.

Thus it is evident that the time which should be taken to finish University education should be less than what is at present taken to obtain even the B. A. degree, while very considerable additions have been made to the

attainments to be expected from a graduate, the least to be expected being the attainments of an M.A. of to-day. This is possible to do mainly through the adoption of the vernacular as the medium of instruction, and the pursuit of better methods of teaching.

It is desired that Mussulman should take infinitely great deal more interest than they do at present in science, and with that object in view it is proposed to impart scientific information even in the Primary stage to form the foundation of future educational superstructure. It is hoped that in the Secondary stage too special encouragement will be offered in the schools for the study of Science, and that a larger percentage of the University students would take their degree in science than do at present. But science requires expensive Laboratories, and it is for the Muslim community to decide what it must do to provide for the study of this, the most essential subject after religion.

In the teaching of History, the history of Islam as well as the history of India is to be included, and in the last two years of the Secondary course another historical subject is to be selected, such as Ancient History of Greece, Rome, India or the Semetic races, a period of European or Asiatic History, or the outlines of the constitutional History of England; and in the school of History for the degree similar provision is to be made for Islamic History. But it must be stated that one cannot be satisfied with the present methods of teaching History, as if various countries were entirely detached and unconnected units. This is a wrong and perverse method of teaching history, which has so far resulted in a narrowed outlook and much international jealousy. It is therefore proposed that whatever historical subjects be taught, they should be taught in such a manner that true historical proportion and perspective may be retained. For this purpose even in the Primary stage some idea should be imparted to the student of large world movements from which the history of his own country and people cannot legitimately be detached. In subsequent stages, the outlines of World History, or the History of the Human Race, as distinguished from the history, or the History of different nations and countries, and particularly of different dynasties, must be taught. This need not, and in fact cannot, be done in any great detail. But without this larger view it is to be apprehended that historical teaching would still further deteriorate, on account of the very intense present-day patriotism itself. Mr. H. G. Wells' new History, although far from satisfactory, and, in the case of Islam, grossly defective, is nevertheless a great pioneer work in History, and his methods are certain to be followed by those who possess greater and more accurate knowledge of historical details.

With regard to teaching Mathematics in the Primary stage, the children's minds are at present only too frequently overloaded by setting to them for solution arithmetical problems of great length and complexity such as grown up men themselves are very seldom required to solve in practical life. Therefore the practice is to be strongly condemned of setting such complex and

tedious problems, particularly in the 'Simplification' of vulgar fractions. They may be very good tests of industry and patience, but they are more suitable for grown up youths than for small children. It is only by discarding this practice that it will be possible to proceed as fast as is desired, and teach a boy of 12 enough Arithmetic to enable him to solve simple problems in Rule of Three, Interest, Areas etc. with which a village lad, and even a town lad, for the matter of that, would have to deal every day in practical life. It is much better to cover larger surface in shorter time than to be content with the child's complete mastery of a few rules which leaves him ignorant of much that he will be called upon in after life to show knowledge of, while knowing much that he will have little need of in his daily dealings with people.

We should also abandon the practice of making the study of Mathematics other than Arithmatic and elementary Mensuration compulsory. The great educational value of Algebra and Geometry is to be acknowledged; but it is not possible to teach as many subjects as a young man of culture should know if Geometry and Algebra are also retained as compulsory subjects. To those who have a natural aptitude for Mathematics, and those who would take up a profession requiring previous knowledge of these branches of Mathematics, can select that subject in the Secondary stage as one of their optional subjects.

Elementary Drawing is to be included in the Primary stage as necessary for training the hand and the eye of the child, and for developing in him a perception of beauty and a sense of proportion, but in the Secondary stage it must be merely optional, and those who desire to take up a vocation in after-life in which a knowledge of Drawing is necessary can take it as one of their optional subjects.

One main departure from present day schemes of studies, as great as the emphasis that has been laid on religious education, and all change in the medium of instruction, is compulsory Manual Training and the pursuit of a vocation. In the Primary stage this will in the main train a child's hand and eye besides providing for him a recreation with utility. But since the majority of the students in the Primary stage would become agriculturists, elementary theoretical and practical training should be imparted to them in Agriculture, in addition to elementary instruction in Hygiene; and flower and vegetable gardening could easily lead to agriculture. In town schools this may be modified, and some other vocational study substituted for agriculture. And in the present state of India spinning must be compulsory even for boys. But in the Secondary and University stage also vocational study should be compulsory. Every school and college cannot, and need not, provide for the study of all vocations. But there is a vast choice from which each school and college can select such vocations as it can provide for locally. For instance there should be no difficulty in Moradabad schools to provide for teaching 'Bharat' or 'Gilat' work, and in Aligarh schools to provide for lock-

making; but carpentry, cookery, masonry, dyeing, laundry, accountancy, stenography, smithy, tailoring, weaving, tanning, book-binding, leather goods manufacturing, and many others provide ample material from which to select. Throughout a student's career he should pursue one or more vocations, so that in a few years Indian students may entirely get rid of the present financial helplessness and dependence upon employment as clerks or other low paid employees in the public service. No educated lad should be able to justify, as so many do at present, his slavish dependence upon Government service, on the ground that he has no qualifications other than those required for a clerkship. It is not necessary that in after-life he should pursue the vocation that he has studied in school or college. But his maintenance, and there is no reason why, after having received much literary and cultural education as these schools and college will provide, a student should not organise a fairly large business of catering or tailoring, laundry or smithy. An educated man with practical knowledge of his vocation is expected, even with a very small capital, and, in fact, even with none at all save his own labour, to build up a fair business in course of time.

Besides this obvious utility, pursuit of vocational studies would impress the educated youth with the dignity and importance of labour, and also remove that estrangement that exists at present between the educated classes and the masses dependent upon vocation. And apart from improving the chances of a student in after life, this vocational study will also be sure to result in the progress of the vocations themselves, for an educated and cultured man will not be content with more imitations but will soon proceed to improvide and invent.

It is not to be understood that this vocational study is to be any substitute for Technical Education. The step that is indicated here is merely one of supplementing literary education with vocational training, which is not likely to take more than a few hours a week of the students time. But a few hours a week, which will be no additional tax on the already fagged brain, but would rather provide much needed relaxation, will help and educate a young man in the course of 11 to 14 years to be a proficient workman well able to earn his bread even with the sweat of his brow.

To some extent the Jamia is following the scheme of studies outlined here, and one of the chief reasons why such a scheme has not been fully followed is the lack of funds. We feel that this reason should no longer exist, and that the community should provide adequate funds to enable the Jamia to secure and even train in India and elsewhere, a set of teachers and professors, who could teach their respective subjects to the students of the Jamia in Urdu which has to be the medium of instruction. It is no easy task to secure good teachers and professors who could teach even in English; but such has been the slavery of our minds that Indians, who could teach any subject in the vernacular, instead of being the rule, are very rare exceptions. The ideals of the Jamia have already attracted some splendid teachers, who

have sacrificed the larger emoluments that they could easily get elsewhere, and we have every hope that in course of time many other patriots of this type would be attracted to the Jamia. But it must be confessed that for some time to come the Jamia must depend in the main on those whose services could be secured only at the market rate. That rate is, as the whole world knows, exceedingly high to-day, thanks to the Indian Educational Service, to which as to other Indian Services the lead is always given by the Indian Civil Service. Education is, at least in England, still the most poorly paid service and it was not many years ago that splendid college tutors at Oxford received not more than £ 300 a year if even that. But when Government college professors in India must maintain motor-cars and occasionally also a string of polo ponies, and, at any rate, must keep their families in hill stations during the summer, if not in England, Indian educationists also demand the salaries of at least of junior Deputy Collectors. If, therefore, the Jamia is to secure those rare beings, Indians who can teach their special subjects in Urdu, the Mahommedans of India must provide adequate funds for securing their services. But in another five or six years the old *alumni* of the Jamia would themselves be ready to become its teachers and professors, and a few are already preparing themselves for this work in Europe. From these we can expect and *demand* self-sacrifice as well as ability and the Jamia expenditure would not then be so unduly high.

The Jamia must also engage the services of an Arab, a Persian, a Turk and an Afghan to teach Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Pushto by the Direct Method to the Jamia students. It is difficult in India, if not impossible, to secure Indian teachers of these languages who can rid themselves of the evil habit of beginning with musty grammars first, and the only remedy therefore is to get such *Ahil-i-Zaban* who do not know a word of any Indian language and would compel the students to learn their language in daily contact with them just as children learn their mother tongue. Luckily Arabs and Persians do not expect the emoluments even of Indian professors in Government service; but if the Jamia is to live from hand to mouth, as it has been doing so far, it cannot escape the temptation of regarding Arab, Persian, Turk and Afghan teachers of their respective languages by the Direct Method as luxuries of which it should not dream to-day.

Above all the atmosphere of the Jamia even to-day is far more Islamic and national than is to be found in any other Muslim educational institution, and that itself gives the Jamia sufficient title to substantial financial assistance from Indian Mussulmans. We do not desire to say one bitter word about Muslim students who are receiving education elsewhere to-day. Nobody knows it better than we do that it is not always their fault that they are not at the Jamia. But whosesoever may be at fault, we feel, and many of them feel themselves, that they are robbed of some of their most cherished ideals by the separation of Jamia students and teachers and the existence of the Jamia as a separate and distinct institution. The present

writer met at a railway station some bright and smart-looking men wearing Turkish fezes, and he was told that they were Aligarh boys studying in the University that has just celebrated its Jubilee by receiving the Viceroy at Aligarh. He could not help going up to them and asking them why they still wore Turkish fezes. The question was not easily intelligible to them, and may not be so to the reader, too, without further explanation. The fez was an indication of Islamic faith and of the world-wide sympathies of Mussulmans, and in particular of their sympathy with the Khilafat and with the Turks who had maintained it for four eventful centuries of hard struggle against Christian and European aggression. In the hour of the supremest need of Islam, of the Khilafat and of Turkey these students and their teachers and the Trustees that managed that institution had at the very best remained neutral, and had refused to take sides as belligerents against the enemies of Islam, of the Khilafat and of Turkey. These students were therefore asked what it was that they desired to indicate to the Turks by wearing their peculiar head-dress. Did they mean to convey that if the existence of Islam, of the Khilafat or of Turkey was again in peril they would come to their rescue? They have certainly not done so in the crisis that began after the Armistice and that is really not yet over. How then could any one form any expectations from them for the future? This was said more in sorrow than in anger, and the students did not therefore misunderstand the question. But they admitted that they were unable to answer it. This was a year and half ago, and since then the present writer has met at Aligarh and elsewhere many a Mussulman student who has confessed that he has no ideal left to cherish. He has failed Islam and he has failed India. These are unsophisticated youngmen whom age and experience have not yet sufficiently hardened, and they have not yet learned to cover their own failure under the cynical formula that Non-co-operation has failed. Now, at the Jamia there are still to-day some 100 young men who have not yet failed Islam and India, and still cherish the high ideals of their faith and of their nation. There were, of course, many more such men at the Jamia not so long ago, and the temptation that other and better 'equipped' institutions provided for them proved too strong for some of them and they left the Jamia. Some of those who are still there may be struggling against these very temptations and may yet fall. Manifestly we have no desire to run down, and we certainly do not despise the students studying elsewhere; nor do we place those who still study in the Jamia on a very high pedestal as being altogether of a different *kind*. There is only a question of *degree* in most cases, but it is not negligible. What we ask the Mussulmans is to say, and to say it finally, whether they desire to preserve even this difference of degree; whether they want even those few that have remained steadfast to give up their cherished ideals—Islamic and National—and seek 'careers' only. If these ideals are worth something, then a place with the Islamic and national atmosphere of the Jamia must be maintained and it should be properly equipped. Cannot seventy millions of Mussulmans

provide even ten lakhs as a first instalment to maintain the Jamia even as *one among many others* ? We shall be untrue to our ideals if we did not maintain that to our mind the ideal of the Jamia is the sole ideal that should prevail. But we bow our head before the exigencies of 'practical politics', and only ask the Mussulmans of India whether they will not allow this sole ideal to survive even as *one among many*. We cannot say that in future there is to be 'no struggle for existence', and that we do not hope for 'the survival of the fittest'. But to-day the appeal is modest enough, and the Jamia will be content to 'live and let live'. What, then, is the answer of the Muslim community ? It must not be, as we have already said : 'Oh, we *like* the Jamia to live by all means'. What the Mussulmans have got to do to-day is to prove that they *like it to live*, and to provide the means for its survival.

Source : The Comrade, January 1925.

5

UNITY
SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI REVIEWS THE SITUATION

Broad-based on the solid rock of Hindu-Muslim Unity, India's constitutional edifice will be more beautiful than that loveliest of all monuments of love, the Taj of Agra : built on that sure foundation, it will be more permanent than even the Pyramids of Egypt. Without Hindu-Muslim Unity, Swaraj is bound ever to remain a mere dream, a mirage which, as we seem to approach it, will recede further and further.

But this unity, in order that it may bring about the desired results, must not be founded on common hatred. For, common hatred is in itself a thing of evil and its product can never be good. The cause of hatred being removed from the hearts of even one of the parties, such artificial unity itself comes to an end. In order to achieve the end in view, this unity must be the spontaneous outcome of a true-hearted patriotism, of the just recognition of each other's equitable rights and interests and of a sincere conviction that both being children of the same mother each is indispensable to the other.

Only five years ago, I saw them embrace each other as if two brothers

had met after ages of separation : I saw them even drink *sherbat* out of the same tumbler. The spectacle was indeed pleasing to the eye of the superficial observer, but the student of causes and effects foresaw the transitory character of this artificial union. It was based mainly on common hatred : it could not last. Born of a thing of evil, its results manifested themselves in destruction, yea, even in blood-shed, setting the clock of progress back by many years. The *Shuddhi* and *Sangathan* among the Hindus having given rise to *Tabligh* and *Tanzim* among the Mahommedans, religious passions were roused to an extent unknown in recent Indian history. And the results of this rousing of religious passions were heart-breaking-riots, in which scores lost their lives and hundreds were injured; looting in which the householder and the shopkeeper suffered grievous injury; and incendiarism, in which properties of incalculable value were destroyed. Even places of worship did not escape the hands of fury.

The hearts of all true Indian patriots must mourn over this shattering of ardent dreams by this spectacle of fratricidal warfare. Mother India weeps over this mad folly of her children. Seeing some of her children preach fraternal love from the platforms of unity conferences in passionate language and at the very next moment fly hither and thither hatching schemes of communal aggression, her heart is well-nigh broken.

As if the rivalry for power, the fight for loaves and fishes, the manoeuvring for ascendancy were not enough, to this whirl-wind of secular friction is now added the storm of religious animosities. It is this rousing of religious passions on both sides which constitutes the dire feature of the new situation. And unless all sincere patriots, Hindus and Muslims, combine whole-heartedly to put an end to this new phase, destructive of all inter-communal co-operation and goodwill, there is no hope for India's future. All organised effort for conversion and physical culture, intended for purposes of supremacy must be abandoned on both sides. So long as religious passions continue to be roused as they have been during the last two years closer union between the two communities by means of a common understanding on things political will be impossible. Let those who believe that without Hindu-Muslim unity India can never attain her dream of Swaraj, concentrate all their efforts and all their energies on this acute phase of the existing situation. Once religious passions, roused by those who are ever ready to resort to anything calculated to realise for them their dreams of leadership, die away and a genuine consciousness of brotherhood and of identity of interests is created in the hearts of the Hindu and of the Muslim alike, an equitable settlement of all other controversies will become easy.

Resolutions on paper, passed by gatherings, however seemingly representative, will not accomplish this desired end. What is needed is the translation of sentiments embodied in such resolutions into earnest action by means of practical steps adopted in the different parts of India. Let a network of Arbitration Boards, consisting of Hindus and Mussulmans possessing

influence among their peoples and imbued with a sincere desire for Hindu-Muslim unity, be established in all provinces and in all districts where the dragon of religious hatred has shown its head. Let these arbitration boards see to it that scenes such as we have recently witnessed in Kohat, Cawnpore, Delhi, Lucknow, Allahabad and other places become impossible of occurrence in the near future. Unless we set to work in right earnest and in a spirit of whole-hearted enthusiasm along these lines, all our political activities for the attainment of Swaraj for India will come to nought. Swaraj in these conditions will be like a house built on sand incapable of withstanding the slightest shock. Once this is accomplished, let us settle once for all, in a spirit of generous recognition of each other's rights and interests, the part which each is to play in the future constitutional development of India. Conceived in this spirit, the Hindu-Muslim Pact, brought into operation in an atmosphere of mutual love and toleration, will constitute the surest foundation upon which, by means of constructive work and scrupulous avoidance of destructive forces, India's constitutional edifice can be built with the surest guarantee of its permanency and stability.

Source : The Indian Review, Vol. XXVI, January 1925.

6

MOHAMMAD ALI ON THE MUSLIM LEAGUE AND THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

I

We have always held that Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, for whose political methods we hold no brief, was in the main right in advising the Mussulmans in the temper and in the condition in which they were in 1887 to keep aloof from politics, which provided more than enough excitement, and to concentrate their energies and attention on Education, which was attended with no such allurements, but which was far more essential for their development and progress. On the other hand, a new political orientation was quite natural for the other communities of India that had fully availed themselves during the preceding thirty years a period which corresponds exactly with the growth of a new generation of the three Universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras founded in 1857, just when the last vestiges of the Muslim Empire were about to disappear. It was no easy task that Sir Syed Ahmed Khan had accomplished in founding an Anglo-Oriental College of his own community within two decades of the Indian Mutiny in the very regions which had formed

the storm-centre in 1857. In obedience, as it were, to a law of nature, once more nearly thirty years after the foundation of this College, there came into being the Muslim League as a political institution of the Mussulmans, and it is not without significance that fairly prominent among the founders of the Muslim League at Dacca at the end of 1906 were some *alumni* of Syed Ahmed Khan's own College.

II

External stimulus was, however, not wanting, for the Morley-Minto Reforms had been foreshadowed for sometime and a Deputation of the Mussulmans had already waited a few months earlier on the Viceroy at Simla to demand that Mussulmans should be represented on all elected bodies not as individuals but as a community, that their representation should be adequate and effective and commensurate with their political importance that it should be secured to them through separate Muslim electorates, so that their representatives should be their own and not those of a generally overwhelming non-Muslim majority, and that they should be given their proper share in the various branches of the administration. It is not without interest to speculate what would have been the political attitude of the Mussulmans after the awakening of their political consciousness twenty years later than that of other communities if the attitude of the non-Muslim majority in the interval had been that which we have learnt to associate with Mahatma Gandhi. But, however, interesting this theme may be, we cannot find time to dwell on it to-day. As for those who denounce and deplore the creation and existence of Separate Electorates for the Mussulmans, we would only ask them to remember that they were the *consequence* and NOT the cause of the separation between Mussulmans and their more numerous, better educated and wealthier Hindu brethren. The nationalism of these was not the nationalism of Mahatma Gandhi. At the very best they believed in Free Competition, the alien doctrine of the Manchester School, and not in the fraternity of the Joint Family System which consorts far better with our national genius.

III

As one who was intimately concerned with the formation of the Muslim League at Dacca, in December, 1906 and who knows the inner history of those eventful days as only a few others know it, the present writer would like the Hindus to know that even then there were two parties among the Mussulmans, and that one of them was far from hostile to the Congress. The Mussulmans in authority at Aligarh still fought shy of politics, and looked askance at the proposal to found a political organisation of the Mussulmans. *Demortuis nil nisi bonum*, and we love the memory of the late Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk too well to desire to make him the subject of any political con-

troversy to-day. But when the President of the last session of the League not only mentions the name of 'the silver-tongued Mohsin-ul-Mulk' among 'the far-sighted leaders of the Muslim community' under whose guidance the establishment of the Muslim League was decided upon, but gives his name precedence over that of 'the strong-willed Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk', we are constrained to state that Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk and the other local Trustees of the Aligarh College had studiously kept aloof from those that were founding the League, and he came in only at the last moment when he and the local Trustees of Aligarh recognised that the League had come into existence in spite of their studied aloofness.

As for the late Nawab of Dacca, he was certainly keen on founding the League. But on the eve of the gathering of the Mussulmans of all India at Dacca in the Christmas week of 1906 his non-Muslim Private Secretary had already committed him in the course of a Circular letter to the view that a Muslim political institution should be established for the purpose of opposing the Congress. This was nothing very surprising if we remember that Lord Curzon had partitioned Bengal only a year previously, and that the Congress session over which the great Dadabhai Naoroji had come from England to preside was taking place at Calcutta and was none too charitable in it criticism of the Mussulmans of Eastern Bengal whom the Government had managed to enlist to fight its battles by pointing out to them all that they apparently stood to gain by the Partition. Nevertheless men like 'the strong-willed Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk' were not travelling to Dacca to found a League to oppose the Congress, and those who accompanied him on that journey can easily recall the occasion when he gathered all that were willing to accept his honest straight forward lead on board the steamer in which he and they were travelling to Dacca, and plainly asked them whether they agreed with the view expressed in the Circular letter sent in the name of Nawab Sir Salimullah and whether they would find a political institution of the Mussulmans with that object. Every one of them repudiated the idea, and we need not cite another witness in support of this if we state, as we do, that Mr.-or, shall we say, Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haque will fully bear us out. On arriving at Dacca, Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk, Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haque, Syed Hasan Imam, Syed Wazeer Hasan, Syed Nabiullah, Syed Zahur Ahmed, the present Honorary Secretary of the League and the Editor of the Review set about drafting the creed of the League and they soon won Nawab Salimullah over to their side. No one can for a moment believe that Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haque could be a party to the formation of Muslim League to oppose the Congress and fight with the Hindus, and he can testify for the other founders of the League that, howsoever much any one of them may have subsequently changed in his political out-look and attitude, not one had any idea at the time of opposing the Congress or fighting with the Hindus. Messrs. Mazhar-ul-Haque and Hasan Imam distinctly belonged to the Left wing of the League, and were or soon after became very distinguished Congressmen. But we think we can

safely say for all the rest of those that had helped in founding the League that what kept them away from the Congress was no antipathy to it, but the fact that, like many other Mussulmans, they still hesitated to trust the company that their community had been invited to join.

IV

Trust is a plant of slow growth, and how long it would have ordinarily taken to develop it is not easy to say. But when once Mahatma Gandhi took the lead, all mistrust was gone and the Congress inevitably drew into its fold every one of the Mussulmans who had not been already frightened away from politics by the realization that it was not all beer and skittles in other words, that it was not altogether an affair of frock coats and fezes and carefully prepared speeches two or three times a year, but meant internment and confinement without trial, and might soon mean imprisonment as common felons, and even the gallows.

But even before the coming of the Mahatma the Mussulmans were getting nearer and nearer to their non-Muslim brethren in the Congress. The Morley-Minto Reforms, which for the first time offered a political opportunity to the Mussulmans, brought the Muslims and non-Muslims into contact with each other in the Councils, without bringing them into conflict with each other at the polls, thanks to the much maligned separate electorates. Paradoxical as it may seem, the restricted joint electorates of the pre-Morley-Minto-Reform days had kept Hindus and Muslims apart, and it was the separate electorates that brought them together. By whatsoever way they may have come into the Councils, when they reached there they were not loath to work together. Their common disabilities, if not their common interests, attracted them to each other.

Another apparent paradox was that what the late Mr. Montagu called their 'extra-territorial partriotism' served to hasten the development of their territorial patriotism also. The aggression of Western nations against Muslim States reacted on Muslim sentiments in India, and even while undoubtedly diverting to some extent their attention from affairs at home, it hastened Muslim disillusionment with regard to their traditional reliance on their foreign rulers.

The annulment of the Partition of Bengal at the end of 1911, six years after the Mussulmans had been lured to fight the battle of the bureaucracy, completed their disillusionment. Their interests at home were found to be of no greater consequence to their rulers than their sentiments with regard to their brethren abroad. Nothing could have more clearly convinced than the Durbar Announcement of the King Emperor that their dependence upon a foreign Government for support against sister communities laid them perpetually open to such betrayals. They now realized that they could place no reliance on such support, and it set them thinking whether they could not

make a better bargain with their fellow-subjects and fellow-sufferers than they had made with their rulers, and whether at a smaller sacrifice of their interests they could not purchase lasting peace and even secure the friendship of their neighbours and fellow-countrymen.

This led to an alteration of the Muslim League creed. It had at Dacca naturally emphasised in its creed the promotion of communal interests and loyalty to Government, even though it had also included therein the promotion of harmony and concord with sister communities. At Lucknow, a little over five years later, it emphasised in the new creed that 'Self-government suitable for India' was its ideal. This was for the Mussulmans, as the *Comrade* stated at the very time, 'the half-way house from which their ultimate destination was clearly visible.'

This destination would have been reached earlier if the section of the Mussulmans which had brought the League into being had not been hampered by that section of them which had at first kept aloof from its founders at Dacca. It had not been able to snatch from the founders' hands the control and guidance of the League; but it made their progress painfully slow. In 1912, for instance, Sir Mahommed Shafee was elected to preside over the annual session; this they could not very well prevent, but they asked, and at last received ample assurance that he would support the new creed recommended by the League's Council. A more progressive president next year, when the forces of reaction had just been pitted in England against the founders of the League, was Sir Ibrahim Rahmatullah. The present writer has had his share that year in inducing Mr. Jinnah also to join the League, and when the next session took place two years later the progressive party had gone so far as to fix its venue, with the powerful assistance of Mr. Jinnah, at Bombay where the Congress also was to meet. It had also succeeded in getting elected as President none other than that ardent Congressman Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haque whose Presidential Address was far more powerful than that of Lord Sinha, the Congress President. It was the irony of fate that nine years later, when more Mussulmans took part in the Congress than in the League, it should be Mr. Jinnah who should have been opposed to the common venue of these two political bodies at Belgaum. This, however, is a digression.

V

From 1915, when the officials did everything they could to prevent the League from holding its session at Bombay, and succeeded in forcing it to conclude it not in its pandal but in the privacy of a hotel—from 1915 onwards the Congress and the League always met for their annual and special sessions at the same centre, and worked in entire co-operation. In the following year Mr. Jinnah himself presided, and the famous Lucknow Pact which the Government had to recognise and to which it had to give effect, was conclu-

ded between Hindus and Mussulmans and has so far regulated communal representation. If in 1912 it was possible from the half-way house to see the destination of the League, it was easier still in 1916 to see the halting place of yet another stage of the journey. In 1921 if Deshbandhu Das, the Congress President, was lodged in the Alipore gaol when he should have been occupying the Presidential Chair at Ahmedabad. Maulana Hasrat Mohani, the President of the Muslim League, was 'waging war against the King' at Ahmedabad itself, as the Government alleged though not as the jury could be persuaded by it to accept, and at any rate qualifying for a longer sentence of imprisonment than could be awarded to the Congress President. Alas that the League and Congress did not tread the same path much longer. The next stage of the common journey might have been the gallows, but the one after that would have been our ultimate destination a Free India. Mahatma Gandhi's imprisonment gave the weaklings of the two communities the opportunity they had so long been seeking, and from the confluence of Congress and League that commenced at Bombay in 1915, and continued as far as Ahmedabad in 1921, the two streams parted once more, and did not meet two years later at Belgaum. We have been at pains to give this narrative because we desire non-Muslims to understand that the Muslim League is not a body of which the members have been of one political opinion, but that, on the contrary, two parties have always existed, and that during the last three years ascendency of the party that brought it into being has been shaken and that the League's decisions, to-day are not precisely those of the progressive party in the League, though it is not idle even to-day.

VI

We have never spared the Swarajists, just as we have never spared the Non-Changers, when strong criticism of policy or purpose was required in public interest. And we cannot forget the fact that Swarajism was a woeful reaction against the programme, if not a rebellion against the policy of Mahatma Gandhi and has greatly weakened the country's cause in spite of the political splash it has made. But we shudder to think what the consequences would have been if the two great leaders of the Swarajists had been in gaol like Mahatma Gandhi, instead of fighting against his two lieutenants at Gaya, and the Congress, instead of becoming the battle-ground of these four, had been left to those whose interest in it has cooled down in the same proportion as it has warmed up in the two communal organisations, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Muslim League. It is quite probable that some of the protagonists on the two sides would have co-operated with each other and, after abandoning Non-Co-operation for themselves as well as for every one else, instead of merely suspending it as the national programme, would

have welcomed and received with open arms the members of the Liberal Federation and the National Home Rule League and all others who believe in the creed of Words as against the Work. The Congress would then have provided a safe enough platform for their anaemic politics, but their 'nationalism' then would have benefited the nation no more than their communalism is benefiting it to-day. As for the rest, 'the Second-Class Chiefs,' they would have occupied the communal *gaddis* in their petty principalities as before the 'Coming of the Mahatma', and although no head would have been broken, the two communities would have been no nearer each other than they are to-day. The Government succeeded more than it could have ever hoped to do by locking up the Mahatma, and the following couplet sums up the situation created by it only too accurately :

(We have been brought to this condition by the single fact of the wine distributor's absence that the vats are full of wine, but the tavern is empty).

But things did not actually happen like that. The fight of Swarajists and No-changers kept the Congress divided, but it kept it out of the clutches of those for whom politics means either petitions or a pastime. And Fate itself, in the form of a painful and most dangerous illness, forged a key of Yerwada prison for the Mahatma, in search of which India was groping and he came out. He had to solve two problems, the Swarajist and No-Changer problem, and the Hindu-Muslim problem.

At first he tried to purge the Congress Committees of the Swarajists as many other No-Changers coming out of prison had been tempted to try. But slowly he realised that whereas the masses believed in him and were ready to do his bidding, if only someone could deliver his message correctly to them and could remain with them to guide them, the educated classes either suffered from unbelief, or, when believing, were not equally ready to do his bidding. Therefore instead of resorting like Cromwell, to a Pride's Purge in the Congress, he has thrown it open to All Talents—but with two conditions. He would not substitute Words for Work, nor would he narrow the Congress creed to please those who believe in 'within the Empire', even if *impossible*, just as he would not *narrow* it to please those who believe in 'without the Empire' even if unnecessary. An all-round agreement has not yet taken place, but the Committee appointed by the All-Parties Conference has yet to meet, to discuss and to report, and agreement in the end is still possible. In the meantime the two wings of the Congress, the No-Changers and the Swarajists have come to a complete agreement, and the speeches of Mahatma Gandhi and Deshbandu Das in the Subjects Committee on the Agreement are good enough guarantee that it will be honourably carried out. If only Swarajists like Messrs. Abhyankar and Aney also could realise that in the Charkha lies our only chance, and the Marathi-speaking section of the Swaraj Party could be induced to spin rather than purchase the yarn, all would yet be well. But in any case those who believe in the efficacy of the Charkha must, as we have said, go in blinkers and spin for all they are

worth, instead of looking round and seeing whether others are spinning or not.

As regards the other problem, here too, Mahatma Gandhi failed at first to gauge the situation. He was too weak yet to move about as before, but instead of taking complete rest that he richly deserved, and badly needed, he in his impatience wanted to do such work as he could do even then, and began to ascertain, during his convalescence at Juhu, who was to blame and how much. The moment this became generally known, the game of 'claim-jumping' commenced, and Hindu-Muslim tension inevitably became more acute. It was not merely a jocular suggestion,. but had a quite serious side to it, that he should burn his dak every day until he could go out and see things with his own eyes, instead of ruining them by reading irresponsible and exaggerated communal complaints.

The section of the Hindu community that had not favoured the Mahatma's support of the Khilafat cause had taken advantage of the troubles in Malabar—which still remains to be thoroughly examined, and with regard to which it would be still less right to rely on the official version than in the case of the Kohat tragedy. They began to preach to the Hindus generally that these were the first fruits of the Hindu-Muslim unity that the Mahatma had preached, and in this way they sought to diminish his influence and to wean the Hindus off from him. When the Hindus thus induced to organise themselves and to develop physical force and courage began the Sangathan movement, Mussulmans were not wanting to persuade their co-religionists that Swaraj would be Hindu Raj and to play upon the fears of minority.

VII

The Muslim League had not done its duty by the Mussulmans in 1919, and partly for that reason and partly also because its membership was limited by out of date constitutional restrictions, it became necessary to organise a mass movement such as that of the Khilafat Committees and Conferences. Since the Congress was now for the first time truly national, and the Mussulmans could have their territorial and secular interests efficiently safeguarded through participating in its activities, and the Khilafat organisation could safeguard their extra-territorial and religious interests, the Muslim League began to get atrophied for want of use. Many a Mussulman began to question its utility even before the Ahmedabad session. In the keenness of the struggle between Swarajists and No-changers in the Congress at Gaya, that section of the Mussulmans which had so far controlled it, in spite of the semi-permanent President and the Honorary Secretary belonging now to the unprogressive section, forgot it completely. But the Shuddhi and the Sanghatan movements gave their chance to this unprogressive section of the League, and since the Khilafat organisation and the Mussulmans in the Congress refused to range themselves against the Hindus who favoured those move-

ments, the League was sought to be utilized by it for this purpose. Political myopia came to effect the sight of the Mussulmans as well as that of the Hindus, and as they moved forward and each to-day became yesterday, all thought of their common sufferings was left behind and gradually receded into obscurity so that even at a very short distance of time the troubles of to-day began to blot out all recollections of the terrors of yesterday, and, what was worse, obliquity of vision was soon added to myopia, each community noticing only that which it itself suffered, and failing to see the suffering it too had caused to others.

VIII

Luckily, however, the unprogressive section of the Muslim League is also by far its less energetic section, and the session sought to be held in Lucknow in 1923 had to be adjourned because there was not even a quorum of 75 members. At Lahore last summer this adjourned session was held mainly through the enlistment of new members, locally or from the neighbouring districts, who furnished the quorum. From the other provinces barely two dozen members had attended, and these were for the most part just those who were hostile to the new orientation of the League, and had come only to hold a watching brief. Six months later the next annual session has just been held at Bombay, and were it not for the additional attraction of the Muslim Educational Conference, which was held at the same place on days, just preceding the League session, and for the Congressmen and Khilafatmen returning from Belgaum, there would have been no quorum once more at an annual session of the League. What would have happened but for the latter is indicated by the Address of the President, who was the least representative of all the League Presidents, and by the printed 'Draft Resolutions for the Subjects Committee' which were an echo of the Presidential Address. Mr. Jinnah would not permit this foundling to remain for a moment at his own door, and no one else seems prepared to acknowledge its parentage. The most important of these draft resolutions had to be dropped and many of the rest to which we shall have occasion to refer elsewhere had to be altered beyond recognition. We regret we cannot find space in this issue, belated though it be, for a discussion of the Presidential Address and of the League's resolution generally. One important resolution, however, deserves immediate mention. It provides for the holding of a Conference at Delhi or some such central place at a very early date to which the League has agreed to invite representatives of various sections of the Mussulmans holding different views. They are to put their heads together, and make one final effort to bring about unity of aim and purpose among Mussulmans and to arrange for co-operation among all these sections for objects conducive to communal well-being. A committee has also been appointed on the same lines to formulate and report to the League the views of Mussulmans as regards the future Constitution of

India and the Muslim share in representation on elected bodies and in the administration of the country. Let us hope that a sensible and reasonable report will be presented to the League, and that no matter in whose hands the League remains in future, its policy and programme would be more representative of the views of the community than the Presidential Address and the Draft Resolutions and more in keeping with the national needs of India.

So long as the Congress would not permit the minorities and the backward classes to be crushed by the weight of numbers of the majority or the superior 'wisdom' or greater wealth of the better educated and the richer classes, it must be to it that Mussulmans and Hindus alike would and must look for the delivery of goods'—as Mr. Jinnah loves to phrase it—and the only 'goods' that we must all desire to be 'delivered' must be Swaraj and Swadharma. Let us work to that end, rather than go on continually arguing whether it is the organisation of the Muslim League that necessitates the organisation of the Hindu Mahasabha or the organisation of the Mahasabha that necessitates the organisation of the League. Only those need argue this out who have discovered which came first into the world, the fowl or the egg. We shall not concern ourselves with what Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya or Lala Lajpatrai, or Satyamurtis and Prakashams 'do in the Mahasabha. Our concern is to help Mr. Jinnah to formulate a correct programme for the League and to bring him into line with Mahatma Gandhi, who alone deserves to lead all India, Muslim as well as Hindu. The Congress is, and must remain the only National Political Organisation, and the Mahatma alone can be expected to guide it and through it the nation to victory. We trust him as we trust neither Mr. Jinnah nor Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and his co-adjutor, Lala Lajpatrai, and the sooner that all these can come into line with him the better for them and for the nation. If the Congress betrays the cause of the minorities and the backward classes it is sure to be deserted by them and will cease to be national in anything except its name. And if the Hindus think that under the Mahatma's lead it will betray their cause, let them desert it and have it closed. But if it is fair to all sections and classes of the Nation, but some of these sections and classes are out, not for justice, but for loot, then the sooner these sectional and class organisations are closed the better. Let the Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha both perish, and let the Congress and the Nation survive. We are not against communal organisations for communal purposes, but we are against the spirit of communal grab and communal dominance and if this spirit persists it will turn the Congress too into a pandemonium and the mere closing of the League or of the Mahasabha will not mend matters. Unity can be achieved not by unformity alone, and it can be achieved in spite of variety. But the spirit must be the spirit of justice, not of greed, of love, not to loot.

Source : The Comrade, December 1925.

7

THE SIXTEENTH SESSION OF THE ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE AT BOMBAY ON 30 AND 31 DECEMBER 1924 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS BY SYED RAZA ALI

Let me tender you my most sincere thanks for the signal honour you have conferred upon me by asking me to preside over your deliberations. To be called upon to take this chair is an honour of which the occupant may always feel justly proud. The situation, however, which we have met to consider is so overwhelmingly complicated that as I stand before you toady, it is not so much the proud position to which you have raised me, great as it is, as the heavy responsibility which it imposes upon me that occupies my mind. When I recall the conditions under which the leaders of our community decided to hold the historic session of the League in Bombay in 1915, pass in review the rapid developments witnessed by the League at Delhi in 1918 and at Amritsar in 1919 and compare the situation as it was at Ahmedabad in 1921 with the disruptive forces that are at work on all sides today, I feel unworthy of the great honour I have received at your hands. The sky is dark with clouds and the waves are beating high; and believe me I use no more conventional language when I say that, instead of having an indifferent seaman like myself to assist you in this storm, I wish your boat were piloted by a mariner of the knowledge and experience of His Highness the Agha Khan or the Right Honourable Syed Amir Ali. Perilous as the voyage is, I venture to make a start relying on your sympathy and support. And if our hearts are stout and our resolve unshakable, God will give us strength enough to get to the shore in safety.

OUR LOSSES

The short period that has elapsed since we met at Lahore in May last, has witnessed many casualties in the ranks of distinguished Indians—Moslem and Hindu. Sir Currimbhoy Ibrahim, the well-known Mussulman philanthropist and baronet, is no more. He took an honourable share in many movements for the uplift of his community and has left a most worthy example to be followed by his wealthy co-religionists. His indefatigable indusfry and remarkable business capacity were rewarded with huge wealth, of which he made a most laudable use. In his prosperity he never forgot his less fortunate countrymen, and his princely benefactions have earned for his memory the deep gratitude of his community and country. He has died in the fulness of years and honours, leaving a noble heritage for his illustrious sons.

You will no longer see the cheerful face of Shaikh Shahid Husain of Oudh, a prominent Moslem Leaguer from the United Provinces and a senior

member of the Local Council. Almost the last public service he performed was the long journey to Lahore to attend the meetings of the League. Another old supporter of the League, borne down on the flood of existence, was Nawab Abdul Majid. He was ever ready to support a movement calculated to improve the condition of our community. Bi-Amman was a unique figure in the arena of Indian politics. With piety and deep religious fervour, she combined a capacity for political work, which was truly remarkable. The Khilafat movement brought her on the public platform and those who have listened to her speeches—and she was by no means unfamiliar to Bombay—cannot forget the earnestness of her words which produced a deep impression on her audiences. She was a practical social reformer, whose example along with that of Mrs. Hasrat Mohani, has relaxed the rigour of the purdah system prevailing in Northern India. We offer our sympathy to her distinguished sons, Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali, and other members of her family.

In Sir Asutosh Mukerji the country has lost an eminent jurist, a most distinguished judge and one of the foremost workers in the cause of higher education. The late Mr. Bhupendra Nath Basu always exerted his influence for extension of the field of self-government. The country and his own province would have greatly profited by his steady influence in the Bengal Government had he been spared to us. Dr. Subramania Iyer was one of the pioneers of the Congress movement and did valuable political work before he was appointed a judge of the Madras High Court. He was one of the ablest judges of his day and officiated as Chief Justice several times.

Beyond our own country, we mourn the loss of those who, though not of India, loved her with the patriotic fervour of an Indian. The roll of illustrious Englishmen who devoted themselves to the uplift of our country—Elphinstone, Munro, Canning, Ripon, Minto, Morley and Hardinge—entitles the British nation to look back with pride on the record of the achievement of these just and broad-minded men. But to Edwin Samuel Montagu will history assign a unique position. He came into power at a most critical time in the history of this country and, in a few weeks, was able to make the historic announcement of the 20th August, 1917. It is true that the British people were well disposed towards Indian aspirations about this time, but how far they would have been actually prepared to go is an unknown factor. It is a matter of common knowledge now that had they been less enthusiastic, less courageous and less skilful a champion of our cause, the Government of India Act of 1919 would not have been passed in that years, and, what is more, when enacted, it would have been a much more illiberal and unsatisfactory statute than it is. Nor were his services to our religion less valuable. His influence in the cabinet was on the wane towards the last 18 months of his office, but we must gratefully acknowledge that never did he cease to press the Indian Moslem view-point on His Majesty's Government. In the end, this ostensibly cost him his office, though the true causes were vastly different,

to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the question of a further advance. In the light of these events covering a period of more than 30 years, is it right, is it prudent, is it politic for us to identify ourselves with any one of the British parties and thereby alienate the sympathies of the others ? The attitude of those parties towards us may be a fact of which we should be ready to take notes. But it would be a mistake to pin our faith to the traditions of any of them. In the past we have suffered more from England's neglect of our country than perhaps from any other cause. The India Office was known to be such a parochial place that it had no attraction for an English politician of the first rank. For a long time our destinies used to be committed to the charge of indifferent politicians of the stamp of Lord George Hamilton and Mr. Brodrick (now Lord Middleton). With the possible exception of Lord Salisbury, Mr. Morley was the first politician of the front rank who chose the India Office for the scene of his labours. Under the Coalition Ministry, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, a distinguished Conservative, administered the Indian affairs at Whitehall, and, brief though his tenure of office was, it was satisfactory in results. His championship of the Indian cause against Lancashire over the cotton excise duties, and his initiation of a scheme of political reforms shortly before his resignation, are gratefully remembered in India. There is only one conclusion to be drawn from these premises. While we cannot be indifferent to the rise and fall of the political parties in England, experience shows that the presence of mediocre politicians at the India Office has proved infinitely more injurious to our interests than the pressure brought to bear upon any Government in Parliament by a number of members interested in frustrating India's onward march. We should therefore welcome Lord Birkenhead,' one of the most brilliant men of the Conservative party, as the Secretary of State for India. In 1907 Morley described him as 'a very clever Tory lawyer, a rising hope of his party and not at all a bad fellow.' To indulge in political prophecies is futile but I venture to say that if instead of trying to wrest anything from him by threats of civil disobedience, we settle down to constructive work, the future may not be as barren of results as it looks today.

THE PROBLEM

One cannot be too careful in surveying the events of the past 18 months. Momentous decisions have been taken by the Government and by important political parties of our country. Strife has raised its head to set community against community. The repetition of flamboyant platitudes from numerous platforms has made confusion worse confounded. What is wanted is an accurate description of the situation without any attempt to exaggerate or to minimise. The collapse of the non-co-operation movement has been followed by consequences, which its promoters did not and could not foresee. Not only have communal disturbances brought to the surface the inner working of the minds of considerable sections of the population, but the leaders of

public opinion, divided into a number of parties, have been unable to secure unanimity for a common programme to be put before the country. According to some, India can only attain her political emancipation through the spinning wheel. Others believe that it will come by stopping the working of the machinery set up by the Government of India Act. Then others take the view that the best method is to work or stop the machinary as it may suit us. Again, others are convinced that true wisdom lies in working it, such as it is, to the best of our ability. In addition to these, there are minor political groups too numerous to mention. All this reminds me of what a writer said about the Spanish character some years ago. He said that if seven Spaniards were to form a political association, it would soon split into three with one independent. It is to be recognised that we are passing through a period of transition and some of our difficulties are inherent in the situation. No sane man can object to the existence of political parties with a definite, workable programme in these go-ahead times. But if they are to work in co-operation with one another, they must have something common in their programme. And I ask : Is there nothing on which all parties are agreed ? Is there any party worth the name that has not set before itself the goal of Swaraj or self-government ? Hardly ever during the last one hundred years was there a matter on which public opinion declared itself half so strongly or unanimously, as it has on this question. To us it is the question and questions and the problem of problems. The differences—important though they at times may be—between race and race, creed and creed, class and class, are at once overshadowed by this overpowering manifestation of India's will. And yet the irony of fate is that so far we have been unable to separate the essential from the accidental, the changing from the immutable. The display of energy on our part is prodigious. Compared with its volume, however, the effect must continue to be disappointingly small so long as we do not make up our mind to distinguish matters of principle from matter of procedure. For, except methods to be pursued, procedure to be followed, there is no vital difference between the No-changer and the Liberal, the obstructionist, Swarajist and the Independent. After all non-co-operation in its broadest and most orthodox form, obstruction with its varying moods, and constitutional agitation with its somewhat cheerless prospects, are only a means to the end and not the end in themselves. Our end is the attainment of Swaraj. Prudence and experience point to the absolute necessity of the various political parties drawing up, by common agreement, a national programme, which can be worked by all. It need not be a very elaborate scheme. The fewer the points on which concerted action is to be taken, the greater will be the facility in working it out. But two conditions ought not be transgressed. In the first place, the programme should not ignore stern realities. Secondly, the methods to be employed should be practical. This would leave every party free to act as it likes with regard to the measures not included in the national programme. Objections—some of them of a weighty character—can

be urged against this proposal. It may be said that in the absence of a fusion of parties, their meeting together for a particular purpose will deprive them of that enthusiasm, vigour, complete understanding and mutual confidence, which are the life-blood of a political organisation. I must regretfully confess that in the absence of any willingness in the existing parties to modify their political creeds, I have no better solution to offer.

FURTHER ADVANCE

The circumstances under which the Government of India Act was passed in 1919 need not be recounted. There was a serious split in the political parties of the country over the scheme of reforms. The bill, though improved by the Joint Select Committee, failed to give satisfaction. One party openly rejected it *in toto*. The other party, though fully alive to its imperfections, decided to give it a trial, reserving to itself the right to seek its revision at the earliest possible opportunity. In September, 1921, the Legislative Assembly, a body which, in the words of Sir William Vincent, had 'done much to justify the demand,' gave expression to the views of those who had decided to co-operate with the Government, by demanding the transfer from the beginning of 1924 of all subjects to the control of the ministers in the Provinces, the introduction of responsibility in the Central Government with regard to all matters, except Army, Navy, Foreign and Political Departments, and in 1930 the grant of full Dominion Self-government. A long and lively discussion followed in which three members of the Executive Council participated, and ultimately the resolution, amended as below, was passed with the consent of the Government members headed by Sir William Vincent :

> 'That this Assembly recommends to the Governor-General in Council that he should convey to the Secretary of State for India the view of this Assembly that the progress made by India on the path of responsible Government warrants a re-examination and revision of the constitution at an earlier date than 1929.'

In fact, about that time, it was not seriously disputed in official circles that, given tranquility and a somewhat longer experience of the working of the constitution, its revision would be undertaken. The first speech addressed by Lord Reading to the Indian Legislature after his assumption of his high office pointed in the same direction. On the 3rd September, 1921, His Excellency said :

> 'I know that you are sitting here under a constitution which has never been presented otherwise than for the purposes of the transitional stage. There are resolutions that will come before you during the sittings of your Assembly urging your advance along the road of constitutional progress. I am carefully watching and studying the working of this new machinery, and I am satisfied that in the short time, in which it has already existed, you have not yet sufficiently tested its perfections, if you are ready to admit that it has any, also its imperfections which no doubt

you have already to some extent discovered. It is a human machine with human imperfections. I am prone to the caution of age and, therefore, *will wait until I have had a little more opportunity of judging before I pronounce my conclusions.*'

By this time Lord Reading has had ample experience of the working of the Constitution. The evidence before the Reforms Enquiry Committee has aroused the greatest interest in its labours. It is unfortunate that the leader of the Swaraj party in the Assembly was unable to accept the Government's invitation to serve on the Committee. Its report has been submitted and is anxiously awaited by the public. The news that it is not unanimous and that the Committee is almost evenly divided on vital issues is sufficiently dispiriting. But the ambiguous language used by Lord Reading in a recent speech, at the annual dinner of the European Association at Calcutta, has created general disappointment. His Excellency seems to have been considerably impressed by the complications and perplexities of the present situation. His complaint that many Indian politicians and leaders of thought have withhled that measure of co-operation which the authors of the Government of India Act expected to receive, cannot be easily refuted. But is it not a fact that the halting, hesitating provisions of the Act are themselves responsible to no small extent for this result ? I am not one of those who think that the Montagu-Chelmsford reform scheme was unworthy of England to give or of India to receive. It marked a considerable advance upon the Minto-Morley reforms of 1909. In fact the problem with which the Government of India and His Majesty's Government are faced to-day is nothing as compared with the momentous issue decided in 1919. For, whereas in that year the greatest and most important question of principle with regard to the goal of British policy in India was settled, the sole issue that arises at present is whether it is not expedient to enter upon the second stage of the journey. With great respect to Lord Reading I venture to point out that nobody has proposed the adoption of a new policy to His Majesty's Government. The policy is there, clearly enunciated in the preamble to the Act. What is advocated is merely a quickening of the pace. And the strongest argument in support of it is that in the midst of the deplorable dissensions that have of late divided community from community, creed from creed and class from class, all the warring elements are agreed as to the supreme necessity of an onward move. A still more significant feature is that though the failure of the non-co-operation movement has brought, in other respects, re-action in its train, it has not affected in any way the desire for political emancipation. If anything, it has made the desire more acute than it was ever before. The talk of the Congress constitution being interpreted in such a way as to include breaking away from the British Empire, is no more than a counsel of despair. Similarly, the increase of political crime in Bengal marks the mad despair of the rising youth with the present constitution. It is urged that those who believe in the cult of the bomb and the pistol have not declared that their goal is Swaraj. They are,

it is alleged, opposed to all government. The best method of ascertaining their ideals would be for Lord Lytton, or some other high official, to have a frank talk on politics with some of the prominent men among those who have been lately deprived of their liberty. They may be quite innocent for aught we know, but if the Government feels justified in treating them as members of a gang organised for political crime, let it not refuse to acquaint itself with their political aspirations. In short, this is a most psychological moment for Lord Reading and Lord Birkenhead to act courageously. As Lord Minto observed on a historic occasion, the really strong man is he who is not afraid of being called weak. And now that the Government has taken strong measures to suppress violent crime in Bengal, nobody can charge it with yielding to violence, if it shows a spirit of concession and conciliation.

In his Calcutta speech Lord Reading remarked : 'My experience in India has taught me that there is a wealth of real loyalty and trust in the British Government which animates vast numbers of the people of India.' How strong India's faith in British justice is, was demonstrated not only in the European war, but in no less a degree in 1920–21, when, in spite of a tempting vision conjured up by non-co-operation, a large section of her population came forward to work the Constitution hand in hand, with the Government. At no time since the early days of British rule has India dishonoured a cheque drawn by England on India's goodwill, intelligent co-operation and ready help. Is it too much to hope that business-like England will not refuse to go into the accounts and pay the balance to India in this hour of her pressing and embarrasing need.

THE OLD REGULATION AND THE NEW ORDINANCE

The promulgation of the Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Ordinance has given rise to a fierce controversy. In the statement appended to the Ordinance, Lord Reading appealed for the support and co-operation of all those who were opposed to anarchy and violent crime. Whatever you may think of the measure itself, I have no doubt that you emphatically condemn any campaign for the destruction of home, life and property. Those engaged in it do not unfortunately realise the great disservice they are doing to the cause of Indian liberty. No Government can afford to be indifferent to the spread of anarchical forces. If a Swarajist Government were confronted with a similar situation, its clearest duty would be to deal with the enemies of the public peace. It is my firm belief that manifestations of intellectual distemper are a great danger in the path of our future progress and that insidious and corrupting influences are the real enemies of our Motherland. The Government, in my judgment, are entitled to our support in all reasonable measures they take to meet the situation.

This brings me to an examination of the action recently taken by the Government of Bengal and the Governor-General. Regulation III of 1818 was made at a time when there was little peace or security in the land.

Ambitious chieftains were carving out of the remains of the Mughal Empire to provide principalities for themselves; adventurous spirits allied themselves with the rising British power and espoused the cause of its rivals by turns and the resultant confusion was so threatening to the maintenance and consolidation of British Rule that the semi-military situation rendered the promulgation of the Ordinance inevitable. Where, it may pertinently be asked, is the justification for allowing this archaic Regulation, thoroughly inconsistent with the spirit of the modern times, to remain on our statute book ? Its continuance becomes more unjustifiable in view of the provisions of section 72 of the Government of India Act, which vests the Governor-General with ample power to deal with emergencies. The Committee appointed to report on repressive laws in 1921 recommended its repeal. Though the Government were unable to agree, the recommendation has received very strong support from the public. Even if the Government cannot see their way to its total extinction, the advisability of its substitution by a piece of legislation, more consonant with the spirit of the Constitution, to be passed with the concurrence of the Indian Legislature, should be undertaken at an early date. In Bengal not only was action taken under the Ordinance but the Government of that province simultaneously proceeded to act under the Regulation. Be it noted that the Chief Executive Officer of the Calcutta Corporation and the two Swarajist members of the Legislative Council were arrested under the Regulation. If the claim that the Ordinance does not substitute the will of the Executive for the determination of important issues by trained Judges is held to be valid, it follows that there was no evidance worth the name against the victims of the Regulation; or the Bengal Government would not have hesitated to submit such evidence to scrutiny by the Judges to be appointed under section 19 of the Ordinance. As one who is sincerely anxious to be fair to the authorities, I must say that no case has been made out for the Bengal Government in connection with their action under the Regulation.

The case of the Ordinance stands on a somewhat different footing. It cannot be said here that the Government have been actuated by a desire to burke all judicial enquiry. The Ordinance sets up special tribunals, introduces a different set of procedure and curtails and, in some cases, takes away the right of His Majesty's subjects to the protection of the highest court of law in the land—the High Court. All these are encroachments on some of the most cherished and elementary rights of the subject. The greatest objection to the promulgation of extraordinary measures is that they afford an irresistible temptation to the executive to resort to summary methods and avoid going to the regular courts of law. Further-more, the fact that in the numerous searches made so suddenly and almost simultaneously in various districts in Bengal, no arms and ammunition are reported to have been discovered, lends weight to the objection of the critics. On the other hand, speaking for myself I can say that it is extremely difficult to brush aside as unreliable all the evidence on which Lord Lytton felt himself justified in asking for the pro-

mulgation of, and Lord Reading on carefully examining it agreed to framing, the Ordinance. It is possible, though by no means probable, that Lord Lytton, who, as the Under-Secretary of State for India, was known to be in sympathy with Indian aspirations, the Ex-Lord Chief Justice of England who was a prominent member of the Liberal party and the Labour Secretary of State, were all seized with panic. The fact, however, remains that the Government, while pointing to the record of crimes, declare that they were unable to cope with the situation with the help of the ordinary law. It is unfortunate that from the nature of the case, it is not possible for the Government to disclose the evidence and satisfy the public mind about the activities of each individual. While, therefore, I am unable to say that there was no justification for Lord Reading to exercise his extraordinary powers, I am convinced that the Ordinance goes too far. It gives the Local Government excessive powers and does not sufficiently safeguard the rights of the individual affected. This is no place for entering upon an exhaustive discussion; but the qualifications of the Commissioners and the Judges, the authority by which they are to be appointed, the committing to custody in jail of a suspect against whom preventive action may be taken and the option to the Local Government to accept or reject the report made by the Judges on a careful scrutiny of suspect's case, are, among others, some of its obviously objectionable features.

INDIANS AND THE ARMY

Many are the steps India has to take before she gets to her appointed goal of Swaraj. In no direction is, however, her equipment less satisfactory than in the matter of defence. In a remarkable speech in the Legislative Assemly Sir William Vincent said : 'If I had been a non-official member of this Assembly, the one consideration that I would have constantly pressed upon the Government would have been the development of an Indian Army officered by Indians, because on that really rests very largely the future political progress of this country.' This is an entirely true and accurate summing up of our military situation. For, inspite of the grant of King's Commissions to our countrymen on a very limited scale, what is our position in the army ? We are admitted into the other ranks of the Cavalry, Infantry, Pioneers, and Sappers and Miners. But the door to the Tank Corps and Armoured Car Companies is still closed upon us. In the Artillery, we are not admitted as Gunners in the Royal Horse Artillery, Field Artillery or in the Medium Artillery. We are allowed admission as Gunners only in the Pack Artillery, in the Frontier Garrison Artillery and in the Indian Coast Artillery. We are conspicuous by our absence as officers in the Head-quarters or in the Staff of Commands. We are not eligible to any King's Commissions in the Ancillary Services such as Supply and Transport, Medical Veterinary, Ordinance and Clothing, Remounts, Military Training and Educational. Our continued exclusion from the commission ranks of the Artillery, Air Force,

and other branches of the Fighting Services is a sad commentary on the spirit in which the Government of India Act, 1919, is being interpreted and enforced. The non-regular forces are made of the Auxiliary Force and the Territorial force. The former is for the benefit of Europeans and Anglo-Indians, while the latter consists of Indians only. Here again it is impossible to overlook the distinction that while the Auxiliary Force has most of the arms of regular army, the Territorial Force has one arm only, namely, the Infantry. The Auxiliary force may aspire to having some of its members selected for King's Commissions; not so the members of the Territorial Force who must remain content with Viceroy's Commissions only. This description, brief as it is, will bring home to every patriotic Indian the sense of our helplessness. It is urged that the process of making an efficient officer is long and laborious. While we fully appreciate the force of this criticism—though it may be parenthetically remarked that we are not responsible for our exclusion from the higher posts—it is obvious that the present rate of progress will take several centuries before the army is completely officered by Indians. A little more of courage and a little less of caution on the Government's part is the only practicable solution of the problem.

THE LEE COMMISSION REPORT

Not much need be said about the Lee Commission report. The circumstances under which the Commission came to be appointed are too fresh in your mind to be recapitulated. In consequence of the action taken by the Secretary of State, the report has passed beyond the region of controversy and has become a *fait accompli*. It is unfortunate that, owing to the existing political tension, the many important issues arising out of its recommendations were not discussed on their merits. My personal view is that while it was, and will always be, our duty to remove the legitimate grievances of the Services, Imperial and Provincial, nothing should be done to impede the process of steady Indianisation. It is also my considered view that the claim of our countrymen to receive emoluments on the same scale as are allowed in the case of Europeans, is wholly untenable. Before leaving the subject it seems advisible to make a few observations on the personnel of the Indian Civil Service. That Service has had a glorious past and will also have, in the future, enormous powers for good and evil. As an Indian I rejoice that the element of my countrymen in it is steadily on the increase. But I feel that if the Service is to keep up its efficiency, it is absolutely necessary that it should not consist only of those classes that have acquired an aptitude for passing examinations. The time at my disposal will not allow me to enter upon the larger question as to how far competitive examinations are an unmixed blessing. There is a sharp difference of view on the subject among competent authorities. Twelve years ago, writing about the success of the men trained at Haileybury, Sir Mortimer Durand said, 'It was a short-lived institution, lasting only from 1857, but it produced some great administrators, and to

this day there is some doubt whether the civilians afterwards, chosen by open competition, have proved equal to the Haileybury men'.

Sir Alfred Lyall, who had considerable experience of both systems, expressed his opinion thus: 'My great objection to the competition of civilians is that they are too clever like officemen at home, very good at writing precis, and accurate in their legal functions, but without sympathy for the people whom they govern, and only liking the respectable educated natives.' Chesney, a close observer of the administrative system in India, says in his book *The Indian Polity* : 'As to the success of this measure (competition system), it has beyond doubt fallen short of the expectations formed of it by the first supporters of the principle of competition, so far that it has entirely failed to attract to the Indian Service all the rising talent of the country.' One thing, however, is clear enough. Independently of the considerations urged by the Moslem community in support of its claim, which must strike all impartial observers as just and strong, it is neither in public interest nor conducive to efficiency that the huge administrative machinery of the Government should be run by a particular class. It is significant that no Mussulman has yet been appointed to the Indian Civil Service as a result of the supplementary examination held in India. At the same time the number of successful Moslem candidates in England is so small as to be almost negligible. It is high time to take steps to do justice to the Mussulmans. They may not be adept in the art of passing examinations, but it is agreed on all hands that they make excellent administrators. I would call attention to the manner in which the Government of the United Provinces has solved the problem. It fills every year a certain number of posts in the Executive branch of its Provincial Service by holding a competitive examination. There is only one examination, but the successful candidates are placed in two lists, one Moslem and the other non-Moslem. As many men from each list are selected in order of merit as there may be vacancies available for the community concerned, provided that no candidate is chosen unless he has secured a minimum number of marks. The system, though by no means perfect, is yet the best that can be devised, lookin: to the peculiar conditions obtaining in India. I earnestly appeal to the authorities in England, the Government of India and various Provincial Governments to examine and adopt it for making appointments to the Services under them.

OTHER QUESTIONS

There are so many other matters that require a careful consideration. The alarming growth of military expenditure is closely bound up with the question of defence. Public opinion is fully alive to the importance of keeping our forces in a state of high officiency. He is no lover of his country who will risk foreign aggression by unduly cutting down the expenditure or reducing their number. But it would be equally wrong not to cut our cast according to our cloth. As the military budget is not put to

the vote of the Assembly, it is all the more necessary to keep a watchful eye upon it. In the past our industrial development had been sorely neglected. A change, a very welcome change indeed, has been of late discernible in the policy of the Government. The country also welcomes the attitude adopted by the Swarajist party in the Legislative Assembly, and their co-operation with the Government, in passing the Steel Industry Protection Bill in June last. Vastly more however remains to be done. The coal industry has fallen on evil days, and is unable to meet foreign competition in our own market. The paper industry has a sad tale to tell. The needs of the Indian Merchant Shipping are crying. Our currency and exchange problems are awaiting solution. There is work, yes ample work, for all who have an inclination to do it. Let us not forget that Swaraj will not come to us in a day. It cannot be that we will wake up one fine morning to find it knocking at our doors. If India is to attain Swaraj in the near future her vast population, regardless of creed and castes, must set to work at once. Time and tide wait for nobody. Is it reasonable to expect that there will be a change in the laws of Nature for our sake ? Let us dispassionately consider the advice recently given to us by that true friend of our country—Colonel Wedgwood. He pathetically remarks : 'If labour has done nothing for India during the past year, neither has India helped her own case.' This is the advice given to us by a man who is suspected of harbouring such revolutionary intentions with respect to the future progress of our country that he was considered too dangerous to be entrusted with the office of Secretary of State in the late Labour Government.

INDIANS OVERSEAS

Another cause of constant irritation and humiliation to India is the denial of equal rights of citizenship to our countrymen overseas. Lord Reading is to be congratulated upon his selection of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru to represent India at the Imperial Conference last year. Inspite of his best endeavours, we are not even able to claim that the game has ended in a draw. But there is no reason to be down-hearted; let us continue the struggle unswervingly and hope that good pluck will, in the end, be accompanied by good luck. In this connection, we must realise that the cessation of the Congress activities in England has done incalculable harm to the cause of Indian progress. Till a few years back the Congress movement was not only represented there by a strong committee, but the British public used to be enlightened on Indian affairs through an ably conducted journal. At present judgment goes against us by default on many an important question. It is to be sincerely hoped that the chief Indian political organisations will unite in reviving the defunct British Congress committee or setting up an organisation on the old lines in its place. The adoption of new methods of agitation in India is not sufficient to impress the British public. That object can only be achieved by carrying on a propaganda on modern lines in England.

MUSLIM TOPICS

IBNE SAUD AT MECCA

Now I come to the topics of special interest to the Muslim community. The outstanding event of the year in the Muslim world has been the expulsion of King Husain from Mecca. He has left unwept, unhonoured and unsung. His treachery to his Sovereign in 1916, his misrule during the last six years, his overpowering love of gold and his callousness towards the pilgrims to whose miseries and sufferings he was supremely indifferent had prepared for him the fate he has met at the hands of Ibne Saud. The latter's advent has been acclaimed by our co-religionists in every country. In certain quarters there is a tendency to excite prejudice against him in Muslim countries. But the reverence he has shown for the holy city of our faith by spending day after day outside Mecca to enable the soldiers and followers of the perfidious Sharif to clear out in safety, stand out in high contrast with the bloodshed caused by the latter in 1916. Muslim India sends to Ibne Saud her sincere welcome and cordial greetings, and hopes that under him the national desire for a strong and powerful Arab State will be realised. We are grateful that His Majesty's Government refused to be drawn into this domestic struggle and did not depart from the path of neutrality.

THE LATE MAULVI NIAMATULLAH

The execution of Maulvi Niamatullah Khan at Kabul raises a question of more than temporary interest to our fellow-religionists. With the political activities, if any, of this gentleman we are not concerned. Had he been tried for and found guilty of a political offence against the State, it would have been a matter exclusively between him and the Afghan Government. But the judgment, the full text of which was published in the press, shows that on some matters of belief his opinions were held to be inconsistent with the generally prevalent beliefs of the orthodox Muslim faith. And it is this aspect of the question which cannot be viewed with unconcern by the Indian Mussulmans. Without going into the merits of delicate ecclesiastical controversy for which I do not feel myself competent to do, I must say that no Muslim state is justified in countenancing a movement for taking the lives of its subjects—natural born or domiciled—in order to save their souls. If once the idea gets abroad that Muslim Governments are not prepared to allow full religious liberty to their subjects, it will weaken the world position of Islam as a great moral force.

EXTRA-TERRITORIAL PATRIOTISM

Of late, developments of considerable importance have taken place in some Muslim countries. If I refrain from noticing them here, it is, of course, due to no lack of sympathy with our co-religionists abroad. We know our duty to our brethren in faith—be they Turkish, Afghan, Persian, Egyptian,

Moroccan or of other nationalities—and have never been lukewarm, consistently with our position, in discharging it. But there is a higher duty that we owe to ourselves and to our country. The questions that occupied our minds during the last ten years were of an exceptional nature inasmuch as they directly affected some of the most highly cherished tenets of our faith. But now that the Turkish problem has been solved to our satisfaction and ,the Khilafat question has been recognised as a domestic affair to be settled by the Muslim world, I strongly feel that we would be less than just to ourselves if, instead of devoting our time and energy to internal problems of our Motherland, we still allowed ourselves to be distracted by what was going on in distant lands. Extra-territorial patriotism is a most noble and inspiring sentiment, if kept within reasonable bounds. But the moment it interferes with the discharge of our duties or the exercise of our rights as Indian Mussulmans, it becomes a fruitless pursuit, a profitless devotion to a chimera.

LEAGUE'S TEMPORARY INACTIVITY

Complaints, frequent complaints, have been made against the inactivity of the League. Some critics have gone to the length of saying that to all practical intents and purposes it is dead. The criticism shows a lack of appreciation of the magnitude of the Khilafat, and Turkish problems which till recently had thrown all other activities into the background. It was the Khilafat Committee that was looking after these problems and the League could not obviously tackle with internal questions without coming into conflict with that body. Whatever mistakes our fellow-religionists may have made, it must be said to their credit that they concentrated all their energy and efforts on a satisfactory settlement of the post-war question in Western Asia which was inextricably blended with the dictates of our religion. With these considerations staring us in the face, can any Mussulman justly blame the League for its past attitude ? By launching on a policy of masterly inacivity for a time, it has served the best interests of our community and our holy religion.

Moreover, since the days of the great Sir Syed Ahmed Khan the community has stoutly set its face against allowing itself to be grouped into rival parties. As a minority we have enough of our troubles. With a split in the camp we shall no longer be able to present a united front on matters affecting the vital interests of our community. Hitherto we have been able to prevent a split in the League. Not that all Mussulmans think exactly alike on all political questions. But its elastic constitution has served to keep in check the process of secession. Whether in this position the gain outweighs the loss or the loss outweights the gain, it is for you to consider. But to a careful observer the loss is more apparent in action, in results, in constructive work, while the gain is shown more clearly in our escape from disintegration and division. To avoid future friction I would suggest a division of labour. I believe that if the Khilafat Committee looks after our religious interests and

the League confines itself to internal questions, both bodies will find ample scope for the display of their energies.

COMMUNAL DISTURBANCES

The events of the last six years are too well-known to be mentioned here. The whole country has passed through a sure trial but the ordeal undergone by our community was more exacting and provoking than that to which the rest of the Indian population was put. Is there a Mussulman in this assembly, or outside it, who did not feel the deepest mortification and humiliation at the terms of treaty of Sevres which, practically, annihilated the independence of the foremost Muslim power in the world : I must gratefully acknowledge in your name that it was the sympathy and support of our non-Muslim fellow-countrymen that greatly strengthened our hands throughout the struggle. The way for bringing both great communities together had already been paved by the unfortunate martial law regime in the Punjab whose common hardships and indignities created a sort of Comradeship between the Hindu and the Muslim. But there is hardly any unmixed blessing in this world. Out of this unstable fellowship was born the Non-Co-operation movement, the full effects of which we have yet to see. Its huge structure was not based on the solid foundation of a carefully considered plan. The blunders of the Local and Imperial Governments in the Punjab and of His Majesty's Government in connection with the post-war settlement, coupled with disappointment at the nature of the reforms then under discussion, served as the foundation of this edifice. Because in a mood of deep resentment both communities had persuaded themselves that they would treat their differences as non-existent, it was taken for granted that those differences had been removed for good.

To cure the evil is good but, to prevent it is better. What are we to do now to restore harmony between the two great communities ? Fellow-members, let me tell you that, serious as the situation is, it would be cowardice on our part to wring our heads in despair. Are we going to permit ourselves to be deflected from our cause ? If we do, we will be false not only to ourselves but to countless generations yet unborn. And what verdict will history pass on those who are never tired of preaching that Hindu-Moslem unity is an impossibility ? I shudder to think of that verdict. Pray do not consider that I am minimising the enormous obstacles and the prodigious impediments with which our path is beset. But will the descendants of the great Arabs, in whose path neither sea nor mountain was a barrier and the followers of a religion which came into the world to cement distant countries with bonds of universal brotherhood, get terrified by the ghost of Hindu-Moslem strife ? No, and a most emphatic no. The days of the ill-fated Hijrat are over, let me hope never to return. India is as much our Motherland as that of the descendants of the illustrious Brahmans of the Sacred Vedic age. If the flames of internal dissensions are not to envelop and consume both communities, they must find means to live in peace. I know that feelings are running

high on both sides. Let us at once address ourselves to removing the tension. And in this connection I cannot help saying a word about the mentality of a certain type of the educated man. Fellow-members, it is easy to put the blame on the ignorant masses. But can we honestly say that he is wholly free from guilt ? The calculating politician does not, as a rule, strike the match. Perhaps he is hundreds of miles away when the explosion actually takes place. But are you quite sure that he does not help in the process of making the material more inflammable ? He is the leader of the helpless masses in the sense that he knows, when it suits his purpose, how to put them on the wrong path.

THE SHUDDHI AND SANGATHAN MOVEMENTS

No sane man can question the right of the followers of any creed to extend its sphere by all legitimate and proper means. But it is open to serious question whether the Shuddhi movement was not launched at a highly inopportune time and whether the methods employed were not of a questionable character. Had it not been for the existing communal tension, I would certainly have considered it necessary to say more about it. As it is, I would draw the earnest attention of its authors to re-examine their position in the light of the recent occurrences and would appeal to them not to hesitate in abandoning or relaxing their efforts if they find that their past activities have operated to aggravate communal dissensions. The Sangathan movement suffers from bad fellowship. Had it not been a twin sister of the Shuddhi propaganda, there was much in it which would have appealed to patriotic Indians. Perhaps it is not yet too late to rescue it from the jaws of Shuddhi movement. If the better mind of the country wishes to direct the energies of the members of the Sangathan into anything like useful channels, I agree with Pandit Moti Lal Nehru, the illustrious leader of the Swaraj party, that its membership should not be confined to one community but that both Hindus and Mussulmans should be its members. In my judgment, however, it would be more advisible to drop it till communal relations are placed on a more solid and harmonious footing. The justification for the continuance of the Tanzim would automatically vanish with the disappearance of the Sangathan.

THE CONGRESS-LEAGUE COMPACT OF 1916

One hears so much and so often about the Congress-League compact of 1916 that you would perhaps like to know the views of one who, as one of the representatives of the All-India Muslim League, was closely associated with it from beginning to end. Fellow-members, let me assure you that your representatives, including myself, have no reason to be ashamed of their performance. Only those who have been in the thick of the battle fully realise difference between the India of 1916 and the India of 1924. However dissatisfied our community today may be, some of its provisions, it must be

acknowledged, enacted a new era in the history of the Indian constitutional advance. And if we desire it to be revised, we should remember that it always takes two to settle a dispute. The great objection urged against the compact is that it offends against all principles of justice and fair-play in that it does not secure to the majority community in Punjab and Bengal its due. I am prepared to confess that, though a party to it, I must admit the force of your argument. If the other party had faithfully abided by its terms I would have found myself in an unenviable position; and strong and just, though the complaint of the Punjab and Bengal is, I would have had considerable hesitation in pleading for a reconsideration of its terms. But it seems that our Hindu fellow-countrymen are no more enamoured of it than many of the Mussulmans. In fact the first hole cut into it was by the non-Moslem members of the United Provinces Legislative Council, who in 1922 reduced Moslem representation in the District Boards to 25 per cent instead of fixing it at 30 per cent as contemplated by the compact. Similar complaints have been made by the Mussulmans in other provinces.

PROPOSED REVISION OF THE COMPACT

The question of a revision cannot, therefore, be delayed long. With the experience of 1916 to guide us, it must be borne in mind that once you open a settled question you are overwhelmed with requests, demands and ultimatums on all sides. Be that as it may, I think the desire of a majority to come into its own is worthy of serious consideration. If the Mussulmans in the Punjab and possibly in Bengal, get what they want, will it be necessary to revise the proportions laid down for the Moslem minority in other provinces ? I will be the last man to put forward any proposals in the spirit of—heads I win tails you lose. A compromise is hardly worth the name if one party has everything to gain and another party everything to lose thereby. A dispassionate consideration will, however, show that by righting the wrong done to the Punjab, and perhaps Bengal Mussulmans in 1916 and adhering to the pact in other respects, the Hindu majority in other provinces will not be prejudicially affected. Indeed, it will have no effect whatever on such majority. Considering the matter from an All-India view-point, it is up to the Mussulmans to compensate the Hindus for the loss of a few seats that will be transferred from the latter to the former in the Punjab and may be in Bengal. That loss can be made good by making adequate provision for Hindu representation in such provinces as Baluchistan, Sind and the North-West Frontier Province. It is to be hoped that a Legislative Council will soon be established in the North-West Frontier Province. And may I here appeal to the Government to lose no time in granting to this Province the reforms recommended by the North-West Frontier Enquiry Committee. There is, however, another direction in which the Mussulmans may be able to meet the wishes of their Hindu compatriots. The well-known proviso in the pact of 1916 says : 'No bill, nor any clause thereof, nor a resolution introduced by a non-official member

affecting one or the other community, which question is to be determined by the members of that community in the Legislative Council concerned, shall be proceeded with, if three-fourths of the members of that community in the particular Council, Imperial or Provincial oppose the bill or any clause thereof or the resolution.' Very great value is naturally attached to this safeguard by the Moslem community. I have no right to assume that my community can be induced to accept a modification of this most valuable right. In these democratic days, constitutional safeguards afford the greatest protection to minorities. So great is the need of such safeguards that the Allied and Associated Powers at the Paris Peace Conference came to the conclusion that it was absolutely necessary to protect the minorities in Poland, Czecho-slovakia, Serbe-Croat-Slovene State, and Rumania by inserting a provision in the Treaty made with those countries. The need of such a provision has been thus stated by Professor H.W.V. Temperley in his admirable book, 'A History of the Peace Conference of Paris':

> 'In the very nature of things, it was inevitable that in every case there would be assigned to these states a considerable population alien in language, race and religion. These people would be placed under the rule of those from whom they were estranged by long generations of bitter enmity, and in some cases internecine warfare. Some guarantee, some security must be provided that they should not be subjected to injustice, that they should not be deprived of their political rights, nor exposed to legal disabilities and social persecution. This was not only in accordance with the general principles of justice and humanity, by which the Peace Conference was to be governed, but also was required by the most urgent reasons of political expediency.'

It is not perhaps necessary to quote from the terms of the Treaty to show in what manner special protection was afforded to the minorities. The simple point is that the foundation of democracy is and should be mutual security. Viewed in this light it is hardly possible to realize at this somewhat early stage what important part the proviso is going to play in our future constitution. But so far as my personal views are concerned, I am prepared to reconsider a revision of its terms if a satisfactory settlement is come to on Moslem representation in the Provincial Councils. I take it that whatever decision is arrived at by mutual consent, will be equally applicable to all local bodies.

DELHI MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE'S INDISCRETION

The action taken by the majority of the members of the Municipal Committee of Delhi with regard to separate constituencies raises such an important issue of principle as to call for a word. In the face of an almost solid Moslem opposition, the non-Moslem members have taken it upon themselves to recommend the abolition of separate elecorates. I feel I would eb failing in my duty if I did not unhesitatingly declare that our community

looks upon their action as a direct encroachment on our rights. The issue is an All-India issue, and cannot certainly be decided by the whims and caprices of this Municipal Committee or that District Board. Those who are prone to advise us, after the manner of men pretending to possess superior wisdom, must remember that we shall not tolerate the slightest invasion on our rights.

MUSSULMANS AND PUBLIC SERVICES

The strained relations between the Hindu and Moslem communities, in no small measure, arise out of the desire of the young men of each community to secure Government posts. Partly owing to greater economic pressure to which they are subject and partly in consequence of their past history and traditions, this tendency is more marked among the Mussulmans than among other communities. The paucity of careers for educated Indians has heightened the trouble. It follows that if we Indians want to avoid jealousies, intrigues and incessant friction, an effort should be made to define each community's share in the public services. I may add that there is a third party, equally if not more, interested in this question, viz., the Government. But there is every reason to believe that it will not be inclined to override an agreement come to between the parties. The number of posts going to the Mussulmans will obviously vary from province to province. And it seems that in the absence of a more workable basis, we might fix it at the figure assigned to each community for the purposes of representation. It is obvious that the population basis, is highly unsatisfactory and misleading. Take, for instance, the United Provinces, where the Moslem population amounted to less than 14 per cent, about 24 years ago. So large, however, was the share of the Mussulmans in the public services that we find Sir Antony MacDonnell (now Lord MacDonnell), who was regarded by our co-religionists as hostile to their interests, making the following statement in a speech in 1900, in vindication of his policy in regard to appointments to Government posts :

> 'If I were asked to state a general rule by which the distribution of Government appointments between the two great communities should be regulated, I must say that, subject to the general rule, that the best man for an important post should get it irrespective of creed or race, the Muhammadans could not fairly claim more than three appointments for every five appointments going to the Hindus......Owing to various reasons I have, as a matter of fact, recognised Mahommedan claims to a great extent than on such a principle might be defensible.'

The next question in this connection is the method of recruitment. As I have pointed out in connection with the Indian Civil Service, competitive examinations are no panacea for all our ills. But in case competitive examinations are instituted I would strongly urge that the Mussulman candidates should be placed on a separate list and the operation of the principle should be confined to letting them compete among themselves.

CONCLUSION

Fellow-members, our path is long and devious, and we shall have to tread weary steps before we get to the goal. For sometime the stars have been fighting against us in their courses. But there is no cause for alarm, much less for despair. Remember, the clouds are the darkest before the dawn. Already here is a streak of light above the horizon if one will only care to see. Whatever the obstacles in our way, a common bond unites all of us who have started on the march towards the goal. And that bond is service of the Motherland. This ennobling, inspiring sentiment has fired the imagination of us all. The worship of the Motherland has brought to her altar the philosophical Brahman, the brilliant Bengali, the vigorous Mahratta, the sturdy Sikh, the refined Indian Christian the cultured *Zoroastrian* and the austere and unidolatrous Mussulman : Yes, even the Mussulman, to whom this new worship is no idolatry. To her glory let us all sing :

'There resteth to India a glory,
A glory that cannot grow old;
There remaineth to India a story,
A tale to be chanted and told.'

RESOLUTIONS PASSED

I

That the All-India Muslim League strongly urges upon the Government the immediate and paramount necessity of introducing reforms in the N.W.F. Province and of placing that province in all respects in a position of equality with the other major provinces of India.

II

That the All-India Muslim League is firmly of opinion that anarchical organizations can never secure Swaraj to the people of India, and while disapproving and condemning most emphatically such organizations, if any, All-India Muslim League views with the strongest disapproval, the action of the Governor-General in promulgating the Criminal Law Amendment Ordinance of 1924, as such extraordinary measure, being a direct invasion upon individual liberty, should not have been enacted without the sanction of the Legislature and as it easily lends itself, in the hands of the Executive, to grave abuses resulting in implicating innocent persons and in interfering with constitutional political activity, as past experience of similar measures has repeatedly demonstrated. The League, therefore, urges the immediate withdrawal of the Ordinance and the trial, if necessary, in accordance with

the ordinary law, of the persons detained under it, and the League further urges that Regulation III of 1818 which gives the Government powers of arresting and confining persons suspected of public crimes, without warrant, without trial and without statement of reasons for such arrest and confinement, should be forthwith withdrawn, and it records its conviction that the present political situation in India is due to the denial of the just rights of the people long overdue and that the speedy establishment of Swaraj is the only effective remedy therefor.

Source : Jamaluddin Ahmad (ed.) Historic Documents of the Muslim Freedom Movement.

8

COMMUNAL DISSENSIONS

Communal discord in India constitutes a standing source of anxiety to the authorities. The instinct of communalism is very strong and ties of creed and caste ever threaten, at the best of times, to drown the faint call of civic obligation. By far the most serious manifestation of this sectionalism is presented by the relations between the Hindu and Mussulman communities. The main difficulty lies in the fact that Hinduism and Islam represent two anti-thetical and in many respects antagonistic, systems of culture and civilisation. Each possesses characteristic angularities, rigidly stereotyped by religious or quasi-religious sanctions; but each is compelled, by the Indian social organism, to live in contact so intimate with the other that friction is almost inevitable. Partly by enforcing order, partly by discouraging aggressive manifestations of communalism, the British Government consistently endeavours to minimise the occasions for discord. But Mr. Gandhi's campaign roused the uneasy spirit: and this in two ways. On the negative side, since he laboured strenuously to depress the authority of the State, Mr. Gandhi weakened the one power in India which can lead men to rise above communal considerations. Thus the spirit of defiance of law, engendered by the course of his campaign, seriously handicapped the State in its attempt to restrain communal discord. On the positive side, the effect was even more grave. Mr. Gandhi, in identifying himself with extreme Muslim contention over the Khilafat question, endeavoured to exploit, in internal political ends, and assert the solidarity between Indian Mussulmans and Islam outside India. For Muslims and Hindus, alike Mr. Gandhi's motto 'religion above all things' he taught that the existing Government was satanic; that the dictates of a creed were uncompromising and irrevocable. Sectarian passion rose high, in the first instance, against the Government.

But the terrible Moplah outbreak revealed to the Hindus, as by a lightning flash, a danger which they had only temporarily forgotten. The political *en tente* between the two communities weakened. From events external to India, it received its death-blow. Peace between Turkey and the Allies was made effective on accepted terms and not long after, the Turks first deprived their Sultan-Khalifa of all civil power, and then abolished the Khilafat entirely. The spirit of aggression, which had been so wantonly roused among the Mussulmans, was suddenly deprived of its anti-government bias. Plainly Mr. Gandhi had not helped the Khilafat cause; since, despite his aid, the very institution on whose behalf so much sentiment had been aroused, was now destroyed. A reaction set in. The Indian Mussulmans turned their eyes from foreign to domestic questions. What they saw alarmed them. They numbered 70 millions; none-the-less, they were in a minority as compared with the Hindus. Further, while they cherished militant traditions and the memories of an Empire in India, they were now inferior in education, in wealth and in vested interests to their rivals. How then would they fare when Swaraj were attained ? Their communal anxiety increased rapidly, and they put forward claims which by turn, exasperated and alarmed the Hindus. Before long the situation clearly crystallised. The Mussulmans would not advance one step towards the acquisition of Swaraj until their future was secured. Since Mr. Gandhi had inculcated the doctrine that a man's religion is all that matters; since he had execrated and despised secular authority, the Mussulmans naturally fell back upon the dictates of their own militant creed. This attitude was necessarily reflected by the Hindus, now fully alive to the horrors perpetrated in the name of Islam by the Moplahs. The real significance of Mr. Gandhi's policy for the first time became apparent. Blind to the lessons of history, he had taught men, while exalting God, to despise Caesar. But in India, as it has been well said, Caesar is one, while God is worshipped in many forms, whose adherents dwell in mutual toleration only through Caesar's constraint. Inevitably, therefore, Mr. Gandhi's doctrine brought not peace, but a sword to his luckless country.

Through 1922 and 1923 communal dissensions grew apace. In the latter year in particular, the tension between the Hindu and Mussulman masses lamentably increased. In March and April there were open riots of a serious nature in Amritsar, Multan, and in other parts of the Punjab. In May there were further riots at Amritsar, and a disturbance in Sind. In June and July there were communal outbreaks in Moradabad and Meerut as well as in the Allahabad district of the United Provinces, and a serious riot at Ajmer. In August and September there were further outbreaks of a distressing character at Amritsar, Panipat, Jubbulpora, Gonda, Agra, and Rai Bareilly. Most serious of all was the disturbance which occured at Saharanpur in connection with the Mohurram feastival. This was among the most formidable religious riots which have occurred in India during recent years, being accompanied

by murder, arson and looting. Now in proportion to the size of India and the magnitude of its population, the extent of such disturbances as these may well seem small. But quite apart from the anxiety which they occasion the local authorities and the serious strain they place upon the administrative machinery, their real significance lies in the fact that they are but the outward symptoms of a deep-lying antagonism between the two communities. In many places, where riots did not occur at all, the tension between the Hindus and Mussulmans was very grave, and it was only where this tension reached breaking point, that open disorder occurred. During the year 1923 in particular, the flame of communal feeling fed upon events which, under happier conditions, might have passed unnoticed. The redistribution of seats upon municipalities and district boards, the appointment of particular individuals to official positions together with many other incidents, of themselves quite harmless, combined to provide the excuse for fresh bitterness.

Far more serious than the actual riots, as an indication of the feeling between the two communities, was the growth of a tendency on the part both of Hindus and of the Mussulmans, to gird themselves in preparation for future eventualities. In 1923 the Hindus of the United Provinces continued to organise a 'reclamation' (Shuddhi) movement for recalling to the fold of orthodox Hinduism certain communities who were Mussulmans merely in name. This represented one manifestation of the Hindu Maha Sabha movement, the aim of which is to infuse fresh life into Hinduism and to organize the Hindus as a community in opposition to those who would threaten their interests. The Maha Sabha movement has established active branches in various localities, which encourage physical culture among the Hindus, and, in general foster the growth of a militant spirit for the progress of the community. The whole movement for the reclamation of *quasi*-Hindus, for the organisation of the Hindu Community for self-advance, and for the encouragement of a compact and disciplined organisation, is conveniently known as *Sangathan*. In opposition to this manifestation, the Mussulmans have organized the *Tanzim* movement. This aims at the enlargement of the Mussulman community by conversion from other creeds, at the organisation of an Islamic brotherhood to protect the interests of Mussulmans, and at the concentration of the efforts of the community to resist attempt at the reclamation of any members to the fold of Hinduism.

It may well be imagined that such a state of affairs, following as it did upon the feet of Mr. Gandhi's boasted Hindu-Muslim unity, constituted a grave obstacle to the progress of the nationalist campaign. No real political activity, as this is generally understood by the educated classes in India, can come into existence unless a working agreement between the Hindus and Mussulmans is established. During the last three months of 1923, the supreme necessity, from the political point of view, of bridging the gulf between the two communities was fully recognised, and a small committee was nominated to prepare a draft for a national pact. This pact did not

touch some of the thorniest questions which divide the Hindus and Mussulmans, in particular having nothing to say regarding the vexed matter of communal representation in regard to power and office. Subsequently, Mr. C. R. Das and certain of his friends drew up for Bengal a draft of a Hindu-Mussulman pact which attempted to lay down a definite proportional representation in all offices for the two communities. Representation to the local bodies was to be in the proportion of sixty to forty; sixty to the community which was in the majority, and forty to the minority. It was also proposed that 55 per cent of the Government posts should go to Mahommedans. From the point of view of conciliating Mahommedan opinion in Bengal and enabling the Swarajists in that Province to build up a working majority in the local council, this agreement seems to have served its purpose for the moment. But it at once aroused a flame of opposition among Hindus of every political complexion; and was decisively defeated at the Coconada meeting of the Indian National Congress............While the Legislative Assembly was actually sitting, public attention was diverted from politics to the subjects of communal dissensions. We have already referred to the unfortunate atmosphere characterising the beginning of the year 1924. As the months went on, the tension became increasingly serious. Relations between Hindus and Mussulmans became acute in several Provinces. In Bombay and Madras communal feeling was not marked, although in Sind material for a dangerous situation perhaps exists. In the Central Provinces, in Bengal, in Behar and in the United Provinces, the intercourse between the two communities was marked by growing acerbity. In the Punjab, the situation was dangerous. During the early months of 1924, the communal press on either side indulged in an orgy of abuse. To such heights did this proceed, that in June even Mr. Mahomed Ali openly pressed Government to take action against the flood of scurrility. The local Governments were keeping a close watch on the press throughout and trying to check these excesses by criminal prosecution where circumstances allowed; but the situation did not improve. In the summer months there was a lamentable number of disturbances. In July severe fighting broke out between Hindus and Mahommedans in Delhi, which was accompanied by serious casualties. In the same month there was a bad outbreak at Nagpur. August was even worse. There were riots at Lahore, at Lucknow, at Moradabad, at Bhagalpur and Nagpur, in British India; while a severe affray took place at Gulbarga in the Nizam's Dominions. September-October saw severe fighting at Lucknow, Shahjahanpur, Kankinarah and at Allahabad. The most terrible outbreak of all, which was followed by an exodus of the entire Hindu population took place at Kohat. This incident has already been described in another Chapter. The Kohat tragedy directed the attention of almost every section of Indian political opinion to the serious nature of the tension existing between the two communities. It was generally realised that something positive must be done. Hitherto, while political leaders had borne their share in

attempts to mediate between Hindus and Mussulmans, their efforts had been on the whole unsuccessful. They had taken refuge in a general disposition to lay the blame upon the authorities, although from the tone of the press comment on certain of the occurrances to which we have referred, it seems plain that this attitude merely concealed a disposition not to face unpleasant facts. But the Kohat affair came as a supreme shock to every shade of political opinion. While possible courses of action were being eagerly canvassed, Mr. Gandhi gave a lead to the country by declaring that on September 18th he would begin a fast of three weeks, in penance for the responsibility which he himself acknowledged for the manner in which his campaign had fomented bitter feelings. From several quarters came the suggestion that a Unity Conference should be summoned to focus all sections of opinion upon the evil of communal disturbances. This Conference ultimately met in Delhi on September 26th. and was attended by Hindus, Mussulmans, Parsees, Sikhs and Christians. A considerable number of Englishmen were present, including among other the Metropolitan of India. The difficulties to be encountered were enormous. Communal tension was, as already stated, acute, and there was a general disposition on the part of important sections of opinion to insist upon their rights regardless of consequences. Even among those political leaders, who were pledged to promote unity between the two communities, dissensions shortly manifested themselves; and only at the cost of infinite patienece and labour were a series of resolutions drafted and accepted, laying down the basis upon which the problem of communal dissensions might be approached. These resolutions proclaimed it to be improper for any person, who considered his religious feeling affronted, to take the law into his own hands. All differences should be referred to arbitration and failing that, to the courts. The universal toleration of religious beliefs, and freedom of expression and practice, with due regard to the feelings of others, was proclaimed. Upon the crucial question of cow killing, a resolution was passed admonishing the Hindus of the impossibility of stopping the practice by force alone. Mahommedans were advised to exercise their rights with as little offence to the Hindus as possible; while the Mussulman leaders of the Conference personally pledged themselves to do everything in their power to reduce the number of cows annually slaughtered. Other resolutions discouraged the practice of disturbing rival communities by music, calling to prayer and the like without regard to conflicting susceptibilities. The Conference also established an All-India Panchayat of 15 persons, including Christians and Sikhs as well as Hindus and Mahommedans, whose task it was to appoint local Panchayats for the purpose of conciliation between the two communities. Unfortunately, the Unity Conference has produced little practical result and the All India Panchayat seems still born. This however regrettable is hardly surprising. The atmosphere amidst which the deliberations were conducted was ill suited to any clear cut remedy for the Hindu-Mussulman problem. It seems difficult, however, to deny that the solution of this vexed question must

ultimately lie along the lines laid down at the Delhi Conference'.

Source : *India in 1924-25*, Calcutta, Government of India Publication Branch, 1925.

9

LETTER FROM JINNAH TO THE EDITOR, THE TIMES OF INDIA

Sir,

I wish again to correct the statement which is attributed to me and to which you have given currency more than once and now again repeated by your correspondent 'Banker' in the columns of your issue of the Ist October that I denounced the Congress as 'a Hindu Institution'. I publicly corrected this misleading report of my speech in your column soon after it appeared, but it did not find a place in the columns of your paper and so may I now request you to publish this and oblige.

Source : The Times of India, October 1925.

10

KOHAT AND THE MUSLIM LEAGUE : AN EXPLANATION BY MOHAMED ALI

The Muslim League has recently passed a resolution on the subject of the Kohat Tragedy, and since it was I who had to draft it, I think I owe an explanation, at least to my fellow workers, who may be led to think that the resolution of the League fully represents my own view on the subjects.

In the first place, it must be understood that it is not as if the Muslim League is an organisation consisting almost entirely of Mussulmans of my own way of thinking. In the session held last summer at Lahore we found ourselves to be in a minority, and while we divided the house over one amendment which we thought we could defeat but failed, we contented ourselves with expressing our disagreement in other cases, or simply raised our hands against the motions in favour of which we could not vote. In the All Parties' Conference at Bombay last November the resolutions submitted

even by Mahatma Gandhi did not go so far as he himself and the majority in the Congress would go, but merely represented what he thought would be the greatest common measure of the various political bodies represented there. His Calcutta Agreement too does not embody what he would have if there were no Swarajists in the Congress, but what he can induce *them* to accept by way of compromise, and after dropping from the national programme many an item of Non-operation which he cherishes as dearly to-day as he ever cherished before, and consenting to let Swarajists do certain things in the name of the Congress which, if he had his will, the Congress would never be allowed to do.

This should be obvious; but unfortunately there is a class of critics in the country who are only too anxious to allege that there is a mote in the eye of their neighbour, forgetting all the time the beam in their own eye. To these, however, I do not think I owe any explanation at all. There lie before me as I write two very lengthy and very carefully framed resolutions, one passed by the Sanatam Dharam Conference at Rawalpindi on the 30th November last, and the other passed by the Hindu Mahasabha at Belgaum a month later. Neither of these follows the lines of the Congress resolution, though far more Congressmen were present at these two meetings than could muster for the Muslim League. The first of these resolutions beings as follows :

> This Conference, consisting of 1,200 Hindu delegates, representing the followers of the Sanatan Dharma of nearly all the districts of the Punjab, Baluchistan, Sindh the Frontier Province and several other parts of India, places on record its great grief and deep resentment at the outrages committed by a large number of local tribal Mussulmans on Hindu and Sikh fellow-townsmen on the 8th September and the following days which involved the loss, officially admitted, of 29 Hindu and Sikh and 11 Mahommedan lives, the burning of about 485 Hindu houses and shops, the plunder of the property of Hindus the value of which is estimated at over rupees two crores, and the desecration or destruction of many temples and gurudwaras and which compelled the entire Hindu and Sikh population to leave Kohat and take shelter in Rawalpindi and other places in the Punjab.

Further the resolution not only reiterates that the outrages 'were committed by Mussulmans upon Hindus,' but explains the fact that as many as eleven Mussulmans were killed by saying that 'Hindus fired only in self-defence'. Having thus thrown the blame entirely upon the Mussulmans, the resolution goes on to demand 'an independent public enquiry by a Committee consisting of Hindus, Sikhs, Mahommedans and Europeans, so constituted as to command public confidence', and 'requests that His Excellency the Viceroy may be pleased to appoint such a Committee possible to enquire into the whole sad affair, and to recommend the measures necessary to restore a sense of security among the Hindus, to compensate those who have suffered by the outrages, and to provide against their recurrence'. It requests His Excellency

in the meantime to do several things manifestly in the interests of the Hindus, including the strengthening of the local police 'by addition of Hindus and Sikhs to raise their proportion to fifty per cent of its total strength', and the appointment of 'a fair number of Hindu and Sikh judicial and executive officers at Kohat'.

This resolution was passed three or four weeks before that of the Congress, and it may be said that many of those Hindus who had passed it changed their views subsequently when the Congress showed them the better way. But this cannot be borne out by the second resolution, namely that passed by the Hindu Mahasabha some days after the passing of the Congress resolution. Before I refer to the Mahasabha resolution let me quote the Congress resolution in full so that it may serve as a basis for comparison. It runs as follows :

> The Congress deplores the Hindu-Moslem tension and the riots that have taken place in various parts of India. The Congress deplores the riots that recently took place in Kohat, resulting in loss of life and destruction of property, including temples, and is of opinion that the local authorities failed to perform the primary duty of protection of life and property. The Congress further deplores the enforced exodus of the Hindu population from Kohat, and strongly urges the Mussulmans of Kohat to assure their Hindu brethren of full protection of their lives and property, and to invite them to return as their honoured friends and neighbours. The Congress advises the refugees not to return to Kohat except upon an honourable invitation from the Kohat Mussulmans and upon the advice of Hindu and Mussulman leaders. The Congress advises the public, whether Hindu or Mussulman, not to accept the findings of the Government of India, as also of others, in the Kohat tragedy, and to suspend judgment till the Board appointed by the Unity Conference or some other equally representative body has enquired into the unfortunate event and come to a decision upon it.
>
> The Congress expresses its heart-felt sympathy for the sufferers in the Gulbarga riots and condemns the desecration committed on the places of worship in that town.

This resolution deplores the riots but does not attempt to apportion the blame between the communities concerned therein. It advises the public, whether Hindu or Mussulman, not to accept the findings of the Government of India nor that of any other, and to suspend judgment till the Board appointed by the Unity Conference or some other equally representative body has enquired into the unfortunate event and come to a decision upon it. In the case of Gulbarga, too, it expresses sympathy for the sufferers and condemns the desecration committed on the *places of worship* in that town, and does not confine its sympathy merely to the Hindus, nor its condemnation of sacrilege to the desecration of temples. It is also to be noted that in the case of Kohat temples it is their *destruction* that is referred to and not *desecration*. It does no doubt deplore 'the *enforced* exodus of the Hindu

population from Kohat', and it strongly urges the Mussulmans of Kohat to 'assure their Hindu brethren of full protection of their lives and property, and to invite them to return as their honoured friends and neighbours,' and advises the refugees not to return to Kohat except upon an honourable invitation from the Kohat Mussulmans and upon the advice of Hindu and Mussulman leaders'. But before supporting this resolution I had satisfied myself that Mahatma Gandhi, who had framed it, did not intend to suggest that the Hindu exodus, which was certainly not voluntary, was necessarily forced upon them by the Mussulmans. I had also ascertained that the Mahatma did not intend the invitation of the Mussulmans of Kohat to the Hindus to return, and their assurance of full protection of their lives and property to be interpreted as acknowledgment of their guilt without any blame whatsoever attaching to Hindus also. He desired that the Hindus should be invited to Kohat not necessarily for an apology being tendered to them by the Mussulmans as if the latter alone were guilty, but, if necessary, also for the settlement of all disputed points through impartial arbitrators.

Now compare with this the attitude of Lala Lajpatrai as indicated in his interview given at Madras to a representative of the *Bombay Chronicle*. Besides condoning the provocation offered by some Hindus under the cover of accepting that 'the young Hindu was very indiscreet and foolish in publishing the pamphlet', and weakening his admission still further by adding that 'pamphlets like that have been published before in different parts of the country both by Hindus and Mahommedans', the Lalaji states that it was the Mussulmans who had 'turned out practically the whole community and forced them to take shelter in a place two hundred miles away'. There is much else besides of the same nature, but rather than discuss his individual views, I would quote here the resolution of the Hindu Mahasabha to which he had invited all Hindus for the formulation of views and schemes that he thought the Indian National Congress was unable to do. That resolution ran as follows :

RESOLVED :

(1) That this Conference places on record its great grief at the outrage committed by a large number of local and tribal Mussulmans on their Hindu and Sikh fellow-countrymen on the 9th September and the following days which involved great loss of life and property the burning of about 475 Hindu houses and shops and desecration or destruction of many temples and Gurudwaras, and which compelled the entire Hindu and Sikh population to leave Kohat and to seek shelter in Rawalpindi and other places in the Punjab;

(2) That this Conference regrets to record its conviction that though the Local authorities were previously informed of the impending danger, they failed to take the steps which were necessary to prevent the disturbance, and after it had begun, to quell it, and to arrest the offenders and to recover the

looted property though they could have easily nipped the evil in the bud with the help of a small force of sepoys or soldiers from the adjoining Contonment;

(3) That this Conference regrets to have to record its opinion that in the face of the said outrages which were unprecedented in extent, the Government of the N.W.F. Province has shown lamentable lack of sympathy with the sufferings of the 3,(00 and more Kohati Hindus and Sikhs, who have become homeless and penniless, and who have been living for nearly four months now at Rawalpindi and other places on the charity of their co-religionists, and incompetency in dealing with the situation, which largely accounts for no reconciliation having been brought about so long between the Mahommedans and Hindus of Kohat;

(4) That this Conference regrets to note that the Chief Commissioner of the N.W.F. Province and the Government of India have accepted the findings arrived at by a very Junior Magistrate, who did not examine the Hindus, nor gave them any opportunity for establishing their case on matters of such grave public importance as the happenings at Kohat, on admittedly incomplete evidence, and that they have arrived at conclusions on such findings grossly unjust to the Hindus who suffered so grievously at the hands of the Mussulmans;

(5) That this Conference is of opinion that the character of the outrages, the extent of loss of life and property caused, and the momentous issues involved demand an independent public inquiry by a Committee so constituted as to command public confidence to inquire into the whole affair and to recommended the measures which may be necessary to restore a sense of security among the Hindus, to compensate those who have suffered by the outrages and to provide against their recurrence;

(6) That this Conference has learnt with regret that the Government of the N.W.F. Province has coerced prominent Hindus of Kohat by arresting them to agree to a reconciliation without satisfactory terms being settled, and that on the failure of the reconciliation negotiation, for which representatives of Kohat Hindus say they are not responsible, it has ordered the arrest or rearrest, of a number of prominent Hindus and Sikhs of Kohat. In view of the fact that several of these respectable men have already been kept in jail for more than 3 months without any trial, and that they are men of position, the Conference urges His Excellency the Viceroy to direct the release on bail of all such persons, and to transfer their cases for trial to the Punjab;

(7) That this Conference offers its heart-felt sympathy to those who have suffered from the outrages and appeals to all persons who sympathise with them to contribute their quota immediately to the Hindu Mahasabha Kohat Relief Fund and to remit it to the Punjab National Bank, Ltd., or the Central Bank of India, Ltd. at Lahore or to their branches at other places.

Moved by Mr. T. Prakasham (Madras)

Seconded by Raja Govind Lal (Bombay)

Supported by Mr. Kowjalgi (Bijapur), Pandit Satya Charan Shastri

(Bengal), Lala Lajpat Rai (Punjab), Swami Shradhananda (Delhi) and passed unanimously.

Then the Mahasabha passed a resolution on Gulbarga also which I cite below :

Resolved that this Conference places on record its strong condemnation of the action of those Mahommedans who wantonly desecrated and destroyed a large number of temples at Gulburga, and hopes that the Government of His Exalted Highness the Nizam will adopt such measures as may be necessary to make a repetition of such outrages impossible and order the early reconstruction of the temples in accordance with the farman already issued.

Put from the Chair and carried unanimously.

I understand that when the Subjects Committee of the Congress had passed the Kohat Resolution, Mahatma Gandhi successively asked Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and Lala Lajpatrai to move it in the open session, but both refused; where upon Pandit Motilal Nehru and I were asked to move and second it respectively, and we both agreed. Nonetheless Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya did not oppose or seek to amend the Congress resolution, and so far as I am aware he did not at least vote against it. But Lala Lajpatrai was induced by his Hindu followers from the Punjab to speak 'in support' of the motion and I have been informed that while supporting it he departed from the spirit of the resolution and clearly indicated, what he has subsequently stated in so many words, that the fault was entirely that of the Mussulmans and that the Hindu were practically guiltless. Soon after 'supporting' the Congress resolution, Lala Lajpatrai goes and supports the Mahasabha resolution which I have given in its entirety. He will no doubt be able to reconcile all this with the support of the Congress resolution, and it will be an interesting study in casuistry. But how after that any of his followers could throw a stone at the resolution passed by the Muslim League is entirely beyond my comprehension. If Congressmen after supporting the Congress resolution can support the Mahasabha resolution also, which is conceived in an entirely different spirit, what is there to prevent a Congressman in supporting the Muslim League resolution ?

After the Congress I reached Bombay on the noon of 30th of December, and reached the place where the League Session was being held just in time to hear the President read the concluding portion of his address. A printed copy of this was handed over to me at my request, and I found that a 'supplementary portion' printed at Bombay, no doubt after the President's arrival there, contained a section entitled 'Mr. Gandhi and Kohat'. The chief feature of this section was the praise of the Frontier officials. I have known Mr. Riza Ali for many years, and it does not argue any special political perspicacity in me if I say that it is not difficult for me as a rule to say in advance what Mr. Riza Ali is likely to declare as his opinion on any public question. And after the recent experience of the attitude not only of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, but also of Lala Lajpatrai and several smaller Hindu leaders, I

cannot pretend that I was disappointed in the attitude Mr. Riza Ali had taken in his Address with regard to Kohat. He had questioned the reasonableness and soundness of Mahatma Gandhi's—and, in fact, the Congress's—advice that the Hindus should not return to Kohat till the Mussulmans should give them full assurances as to their lives and property. His conclusion was that 'a careful study of the Government of India's Resolution, dated 9th December, 1924, and its annexuers would convince every impartial observer that the Government of India and the local authorities had acted in a wise and sympathetic manner'. But not to do Mr. Riza Ali any injustice, let me say that he did not attempt, like the Sanatan Dharma Conference or the Hindu Mahasabha resolutions, to pronounce any judgment in favour of one party against the other. Beyond a general reference, after examining the causes of all riots that had taken place in the last two years, to 'the growing tendency in one community to provoke and the violent proclivity in the other community to retaliate' there was no attempt at pronouncing a judgment.

When a couple of hours later I reached the place where the Subjects Committee was meeting, I was given a printed copy of the 'Draft Resolutions for the Subjects Committee' which I took to be the result of the cogitations of the permanent office-bearers of the League, Mr. Jinnah, President, and Mr. Zahur Ahmed, Honorary Secretary, and of the President of the Session, Mr. Riza Ali, and the members of the Reception Committee. Among these was the following resolution on the subject of Kohat :

> 'That it is the considered opinion of the All-India Muslim League that the Government of India's Resolution, dated the 9th December, 1924, relating to the Kohat Riots does accurately set forth the origin and subsequent events of the deplorable disturbance, and the League while expressing its sympathy with the sufferers, both Hindus and Mussulmans, sees no justification for the refusal of the Hindus to return to Kohat, and appeals o both communities to resume their old peaceful relations.'

This resolutio.', however, was not taken up for a long time, as the President was endeavo-uring to get through less contentious matters first. For the greater portion of the time was taken up by a resolution of Sahibzada Aftab Ahmed Khan to the discussion on which I fear I must devote some space here. He proposed that 'in the opinion of the All-India Muslim League our greatest immediate national need being unity and co-operation among our various sections representing different views, interests and provinces, which can only be brought about by mutual understanding, toleration and support, it is highly desirable that a representative Committee be appointed to study the position and condition of our co-religionists living in different parts of the country, and having ascertained their views and wishes, to formulate the political needs and demands of our community in a report which should be considered at a special session of the League to be held at Delhi on some date in the coming year'.

On being asked by a representative from the Punjab whether he desired

to leave as an open question the subject of Muslim representation in the legislatures and in other elected bodies, or whether he would exclude all discussion on that subject and treat as a settled policy the 'draft resolution' in this connection, which followed the lines of the resolution passed in the Lahore Session in the previous summer, but expressly declared that the extent of representation in all provinces shall be in accordance with the Lucknow Compact of 1916, except in Bengal and Punjab, where 'it shall be such as to ensure that the Muslim majority is not reduced to a minority or even on equality', the Sahibzada Sahib declared his acceptance of this 'draft resolution' as a settle. policy which would remain outside the jurisdiction of his proposed Committee and immune from being thrown into the melting pot.

To the Sahibzada Sahib's resolution Mr. Jinnah moved an amendment, which sought the appointment of a Committee like the one appointed in the Lahore Session for drawing up a Constitution for India, with powers to confer with other political organisations.

Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, in consultation with other of our way of thinking, however, moved another amendment with a view to the calling of a Conference at an early date at Delhi or at some other central place in which representatives different shades of political thought and different parts of the country should meet with a view to co-operate to the greatest possible extent with each other and to decide upon sound lines of united activity

Mr. Jinnah was persistent, and the discussion became interminable. Finally he contended that Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad's amendment was no amendment at all but a separate proposition, and when it was retorted that his own amendment was no better, he induced Sahibzada Aftab Khan to withdraw his own resolution and accept his amendment. Since the President ruled that Maulana Abdul Kalam's amendment was a separate proposition, and that he would not, therefore, take votes upon it as an amendment before taking votes on Mr. Jinnah's proposition, we reluctantly decided to oppose the latter, and succeeded in defeating it and carrying our own amendment as a substantive proposition. Much valuable time was lost through Mr. Jinnah's insistence on divisions and on the reading of names for an against his proposition.

When he was finally convinced that he was clearly defeated, Mr. Jinnah made overtures to us and offered, if we agreed to the appointment of a Committee to formulate the Muslim demand regarding the representation of the Community in the legislatures and in other elected bodies, and their due and proper share in the public services, with power to confer with other political organisations, and report to the Muslim League, to withdraw the 'draft resolution' about the extent of Muslim representation which Sahibzada Aftab Ahmed Khan had accepted a a settled policy which would remain outside the jurisdiction of his proposed Committee. This was accepted by us, but by the time this compromise was arrived at it was already about 2 A.M.

When the Kohat Resolution at long last came up for discussion, Mr.

Mohamed Yakub, M.L.A., very wisely moved that the League should pass no resolution on the subject. We supported this proposition, because we could not hope to carry in such House the kind of proposition that the Congress had passed, and were afraid that if the Subjects Committee of the League framed a proposition on the subject it was bound to be a counter blast to the resolutions of the Sanatan Dharam and Hindu Mahasabha Conferences and very much on the lines of the Presidential Address and the 'draft resolution' which I have already quoted. Unfortunately for us Mr. Yakub's proposition was lost by a vote or two. Thereupon we protested against the printed 'draft resolution' and it was decided that another should be drawn up. Consequently Maulvi Zafar Ali Khan submitted the following draft which he had hastily prepared :

> That the All-India Muslim League deplores the Kohat tragedy and sympathises with the sufferers both Hindus, and Muslims, and while placing on record its firm conviction that the Hindus started the riots in the first instance, appeals to both communities to forget the past and resume their old peaceful relations. The League hopes that the Mussulmans of Kohat, being the predominant element in the population of the town, will receive their Hindu neighbours with open arms.

I was not satisfied with this nor were many others who had supported the Congress resolution. It was certainly an improvement upon the printed 'draft resolution', the paternity of which Mr. Jinnah's indignant repudiation of the 'insinuation' has made very dobutful. It did not take upon itself, like the 'draft resolution', to certify the accuracy of the Government of India's Resolution, nor did it deny all justification for the refusal of the Hindus to return to Kohat; nevertheless there was nothing in Maulvi Zafar Ali Khan's resolution to show that the extent of the Hindu's sufferings was very great as compared with that of the Mussulmans. It also failed to ask the Mussulmans of Kohat to invite the Hindus to return, and merely appealed to the two communities to forget the past just as the Duke of Connaught had asked both the officials and non-officials after the Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy to forget and forgive. As a matter of fact, its hope that the Mussulmans of Kohat, 'being the predominant element in the population of the town will receive their Hindu neighbours with open arms,' indicated self-conscious magnanimity and was suggestive of the Return of the Prodigal Son. It also accused the Hindus of being the first to start the riots, but made no reference to the subsequent action of the Mussulmans. Finally, while it did not, like Mr. Riza Ali's Address, give a certificate to the Government of India and the local authorities of having acted in a wise and sympathetic manner, it failed to condemn them either. It was now half-past-two in the morning, and the majority out of the small remnant of the Subjects Committee left in the room were desirous of clearing away, and were none too anxious to do justice to the Hindus of Kohat or to condemn the Government that had failed so ignonimously. It was in such circumstances that I detained them and

offered to put down on paper a few points roughly enough, and if they approved of them I sought their permission to put the whole thing in proper language next morning. I have brought back with me that rough draft. One glance at it would convince any one that it was the work of a few mintues and was never intended to be a finished draft of a resolution to be moved in the open session of the League. It was agreed to by the Punjab representatives and the Frontier representatives also, but many of them wanted me to drop the condemnation of the Government for reasons that I am glad they ultimately withdrew. To this I would not consent, and the matter was still undecided when Maulvi Zafar Ali Khan unsuccessfully moved a resolution on an entirely different subject. He apparently resented his failure, and thereafter insisted on dividing the House over his own draft of the resolution on the subject of Kohat. As the Punjab friends objected to the condemnation of the Government, they voted against me, and Maulvi Zafar Ali Khan's draft was accepted by a majority of two or three votes. As this was the last item, the Subjects Committee was dispersing, and all that I could do was to give notice that I would move my own draft as an amendment, and consequently I was tied down to the wording of the rough draft which was never meant to be anything more than a rough draft. A fair copy had to be made within a minute or two, and I set about making it without delay. The ink in my fountain-pen was finished before I was half-through, and I completed that hasty document with a pencil borrowed from the Honorary Secretary that needed mending itself. Almost at the stroke of three I gave this 'fair copy' of my amendment to the Honorary Secretary whom I then left in the Subjects Committee room alone with his office typist.

Next day Mr. Barkat Ali informed me that he would not like to divide the House over the Kohat resolution, and, being the seconder of Maulvi Zafar Ali Khan's resolution, he had induced him to move the resolution as I had drafted it, and thus saved me the unpleasant task of moving an amendment which did not fully represent my own views.

When that resolution was about to be moved, Mr. Jinnah came to me indignantly protesting against it but I was not willing to spare the Government and told him that if the mover and seconder would go back upon their decision I would myself move the resolution I had framed as an amendment. Just then my friend, Mr. Bharucha, pointed out to me that I could not have meant to say that 'the sufferings of the Hindus of Kohat were not unprovoked', and I confessed that what I meant was that 'the action of the Mussulmans of Kohat was not unprovoked'. How these 'sufferings' had crept in here will be clear if one referred to my original draft. That would show that I had set out to give prominence to their magnitude, but finding it necessary to refer to the nature of the provocation, I had to score out the reference to the magnitude of these sufferings and accommodate it four or five lines lower down. I asked Mr. Bharucha to speak for me to Mrs. Naidu and through her induce Mr. Jinnah to permit this change to be made. I could not speak

directly, for I had no hope that so soon after my refusal to give up the condemnation of the Government, and my insistence on the resolution as I had drafted it, he would agree to my altering it. Mrs. Naidu was most likely to succeed and I sent word to her through Mr. Bharucha to try. But this effort did not succeed, and the resolution had to be moved as it was without the alteration which would have made it impossible for any one to think that I wished to suggest that the Hindus of Kohat deserved their sufferings.

When framing my resolution on the previous night I was certain the members of the Subjects Committee and of the League itself would insist on referring to two matters which in their opinion were beyond any doubt, one being the provocation offered by those vile verses of Krishan Lal published in the 'Krishan Sandesh' on the occasion of the Janam Ashtmi, and the other firing of shots from a Hindu house on a noisy and boastful crowd of Muslim rowdies which resulted in the death of a Mussulman boy. So far no Hindus had to my knowledge condemned these things, and Hindu newspapers and other propagandists had made it out that the Mussulmans of Kohat had resorted to violence on unoffending Hindus apparently without any provocation. Even the fast of Mahatma Gandhi had been exploited for this purpose, and it was made out that he had, by his support of Khilafat cause and by inducing other Hindus also to support it, indirectly encouraged the Mussulmans to use violence against the Hindus, and, that at last on discovering his mistakes, he was doing penance for betraying his own community.

I may add here that I had feared that exploitation of the Mahatma's fast would take place, and had, therefore, begged him to give up the idea of fasting, and in its stead accept the suggestion I had made on the previous day that he should go straight to Kohat, whither I too would accompany him and investigate the whole affair. I have not yet been able to get rid of the idea that the Mahatma's fast would not have been undertaken if he had been in more robust health, and that it was very much akin to his breaking down in the A.I.C.C meeting at Ahmedabad three months earlier. The outside stimulus was there in both the cases; but the reaction would have been less dramatic and less pathetic if the Mahatma had been physically fitter and fully able to exercise over his feelings the iron-control that is so characteristic of him. I have never before publicly expressed this view of mine regarding the delicate topic of the fast of one whom I regard and call my 'Bapu'—more than a political chief and more than a brother. May he forgive me for the apparent impertinence of my presuming to express publicly such an opinion about so intimate and personal a matter. But I feel I shall be failing in my duty if out of personal regards for him I failed to place things in their proper perspective as I understand them to be.

Now, while I was, and am personally content with saying nothing about the provocation offered by a Hindu and another Hindus's resort to fire-arms, and to let the whole thing be investigated by the National Panchayat or by

some equally impartial board of arbitrators, I cannot say that the Mussulmans, who have been assailed so persistently on all sides as a community responsible for outbreaks of violence against 'unoffending Hindus, are unreasonable if they repudiate such accusations and declare that their actions, however guilty are not unprovoked, that it is not they in every case who first resort to violence, and that if the Hindus suffer grievously, they do not suffer alone. This is what was sought to be conveyed by the resolution that I had drafted, not as my own, but as the o which I could hope with great effort to make acceptable to the Muslim League, composed as it is of various elements and as at present constituted for less representative of the Community as a whole than the Khilafat organisation.

As regards the provocation, I hold that it is incontestable, and the more the Hindus contest it the worse they make their own case. Whosoever would condone such writings would only get tarred with the same brush. Lala Lajpatrai glibly talks of 'the young Hindu' and considers that he was only 'very indiscreet and foolish' in publishing his verses. He tells us that things of this sort 'have been published before in different part of the country both by Hindus and Mahommedans', and adds that 'it is astounding to make that pamphlet a justifiable defence for the proceedings or doings of the other party, which followed the alleged provocation'. May I not ask if his condonation of the 'young', 'indiscreet' and 'foolish Hindu' who gave the 'alleged provocation', and his reference to the 'Different parts of the country'-meaning no doubt his cultured and refined Punjab—where such writings have been published before both by Hindus and Mahommedans, are much better than the sort of stuff we find in the precious petition to the Chief Commissioner at Peshawar sent by the Acting Secretary of the Sanatan Dharama Sabha, Kohat, on the very day that rioting broke out at Kohat. In this he states that the verses constitute 'an ordinary composition the type of which is usually found in the newspapers, pamphlets, tracts etc.' He goes on to say that 'the Assistant Commissioner was approached by a few selfish Parachas (traders of Kohat) and impressed that unless an expression of regret came from the Sanatan Dharama Sabha, a big row would be kicked up and a show of force would be made. At this the Assistant Commissioner obtained, fairly or unfairly, the expression of regret from the said Sabha..............The said poem must have been wrongly construed and translated by the authorities and the Muslims otherwise it is an ordinary type of a poem intended for the spread of religion'. Well, we can leave this evangelist alone, but we may well ask the free thinking Lalaji whether he thinks that such poems—'intended for the spread of religion' in the Punjab are not likely to spread instead in the Frontier Province the kind of violence that Kohat witnessed ? Of course, it is 'astounding' to make that from 'a justifiable defence for the proceedings or doings of the other party which followed'; but I shall be the first to condemn that Mussulman who would set up such a defence in the hope of justifying all that happened at Kohat.

As regards the resort to firing, I heard it from a patriotic Hindu of Peshawar who came to see me on the commencement of the Mahatma's fast and reported that the first shot was fired from a leading Hindu's house, and that the Mussulmans, who were the first victims of this firing, were unarmed. I understand that the Hindus deny this, and although for my part I would have willingly left out all mention of this very important fact and awaited the decision of the National Panchyat or other impartial arbitration, I know that the Muslim League would not have been equally willing to wait when the Sanatan Dharma Conference and the Hindu Mahasabha were pronouncing one-side verdicts throwing all the blame upon the Mussulmans.

The resolution as framed by me clearly states that in comparison with the Mussulmans the sufferings of the Hindus were 'very great', and, unlike the printed 'draft resolution' placed before the Subject Committee and the resolution as drafted by Maulvi Zafar Ali Khan, it confines its expression of sympathy to the sufferings of the Hindus alone. It is, therefore, not just to think that it meant to convey that both the communities suffered almost equally or, if not equally then certainly the Hindus did not suffer so much as to call for any special mention.

Whenever Hindu-Muslim outbreaks have taken place I have been anxious that, if the two communities cannot soon be reconciled to one another in that locality and brought to repent genuinely each of its own misdeeds, then a thorough investigation should take place by an impartial and representative Panchayat. My experience of the propaganda carried on in Western Europe against the Turks by the 'atrocity' mongers had led me to think that the record of the more successful believer in violence not only becomes bulkier with each fresh accusation but also blacker unless each accusation is thoroughly investigated soon after it is made. When I went to Europe with the Indian Khilafat Delegation I challenged, in the interests of the Turks themselves, the 'atrocity mongers in Europe to appoint, an International Commission on which the Mussulmans of India and the world should be adequately represented to enquire into all 'Armenian Atrocities'. I think it would be in the interests of the Mussulmans themselves if they challenged a similar... .. impartial enquiry in every locality in which Hindu-Muslim riots have broken out. However guilty they may really be, I suspect that their guilt would on inquiry be found to be less than what the press propaganda of their opponents has attributed to them.

I regret that both the printed 'draft resolution' and that framed by Maulvi Zafar Ali Khan failed to suggest an enquiry into the Kohat Tragedy. My resolution sought to supply that omission. But I confess that in the hurry of the drafting I used an expression which is most likely to be misunderstood. I said, 'the Muslim League is not at present in a position to form a judgment as regards the details of the allegations published by the Government or by the members of the two communities concerned 'and asked the country also' to suspend its judgment until a Committee, on which

Mussulmans as well as Hindus were adequately represented, had enquired into the whole affair and had reported its findings. It may be said, and it was said by Mr. Jinnah in the course of the debate in the League meeting that the resolution had already pronounced two judgments, if not three, namely that gross provocation was offered to the religious sentiments of the Mussulmans, that the Hindus first resorted to violence, and that it was not the Hindus alone that suffered. This is in a sense perfectly true. The first two statements relate to the origin of the tragedy, and the last is a very general and a very obvious statement of a fact that is undeniable and, in fact, admitted. What I desired to convey was that the Muslim League was not in a position to form a judgment as regards events *subsequent* to the provocation and the first resort to firing.

These subsequent events are not in any sense unimportant, and I was totally wrong in applying the word 'details' to them. The fact is that at half past two in the morning of the last day of the year, after more than a fortnight's incessant work and sleeplessness, my brain was fuddled and I could not get at the proper word. My original rough draft shows that I was groping in search of the proper word, for instead of the phrase 'subsequent events' I had used the words 'other details', and then not being satisfied had scored out the word "other'. It is not because I hold the provocation and the first resort to violence as the *main facts* and all that happened subsequently as *mere details* that have used the latter expression. It is obvious that the Commission of Enquiry was a superfluity and a work of peroration if the main facts had already been established and only the details remained to be investigated. I must confess that the correct expression, in search of which I groped not only that night but even until the 8th Instant, was easily available, if I had only looked into that wretched 'draft resolution' printed for the Subjects Committee which had roused me to take all this trouble in order to frame a juster and more reasonable resolution. On the 8th instant when for the purpose of writing this explanation, I took out the 'Draft Resolution for the Subjects Committee', and re-read the Kohat Resolution as therein drafted, the two expressions 'origin' and 'subsequent events' stared me in the face, and I cursed myself for not having discovered them earlier.

As regards the invitation to the Hindus to return to Kohat, I do feel that it is up to the Mussulmans to send it to the Hindu refugees not with any self-conscious magnanimity as 'being the predominant element in the population of the town 'who' should receive their Hindu neighbours with open arms' but, as men in sack-cloth and ashes who should acknowledge that no provocation could justify such a 'predominant element in the population of the town' in instilling such terror in the minds of the Hindu minority as to induce it to leave its homes in a body and flee two hundred miles away. I am not disposed to believe such foolish statements as that according to which the fire started through a Hindu bullet striking a kerosine tin. But I admit that facts must be investigated with regard to the extent of *intentional* arson, and

in particular to decide whether temples and gurudwaras merely happened to get destroyed or were deliberatly desecrated. My original draft shows that after mentioning the loss of property I was about to add 'including temples and gurudwaras'. But it occurred to me that a mere mention of these places of worship among property that was lost was inadequate, and that it was necessary to condemn the sacrilege that is alleged. But I thought it necessary to get this fact incontestably established before any condemnation was pronounced. That accounts for the omission. But I wish to state that not even Mahatma Gandhi can feel more keenly than I do an utter abhorrence for sacrileges, and those that have read my condemnation of the descration of a temple at Delhi in the teeth of strong local Muslim feeling against such condemnation before the law-court had given its verdict, will not easily believe that I will condone such action at Kohat.

One word more and I have done. I condemn the failure of the authorities to take proper steps to prevent the Kohat Tragedy and to protect the lives and property of the Hindu and Muslim citizens of Kohat, all the more indignantly because, in addition to the terrible suffering of my fellow-countrymen both Islam and India have been dragged into the more by the Government. It should, as I said in the League meeting, have concentrated all its military resources at Kohat and should have shot down every Muslim engaged in driving out the Hindus before making it possible for Reuter and the correspondents of British newspapers to cable home the news of the tragedy making Indians and Mussulmans a by-word among the nations. These newspapers and the party in power are exploiting the Kohat Tragedy. It provided the news-editors with shrieking head-lines. Indians and Mussulmans no doubt suffered grievously thereby in the world's estimation; but the world is not made up of fools only, and when the first shock to it is over, and it can think of something else besides our incapacity to tolerate each other, it will not fail to ask how it came to happen that this puissant Government, with its bloated military budget, failed to carry out its first duty, namely, the protection of the lives and property of its subjects from the attacks of only one section of a small town.

I said at the very outset of this explanation that I owed it to my fellow-workers, who expect from me something better than the resolution that I had to acknowledge I had drafted. I hope I have sufficiently explained how I came to be the parent of such a child, which I was loath to acknowledge, as was evident from my attitude in the League meeting even before I spoke on it, and which I was only too glad to give *Dattak* to two stalwarts from the Punjab. But before I end this explanation, let me say that I owed it not only to my fellow-workers but to every innocent sufferer in Kohat who had to pay the penalty of the criminal folly of those who offered the provocation and of the criminal neglect of those who should have seen to it that the innocents did not suffer by their own vacillating and variable attitude

towards the guilty.

Source : The Comrade, January, 1925.

11

COMMUNAL REPRESENTATIONS

When the Unity Conference was held at Delhi last September, Mahatma Gandhi, realising the root-cause of Hindu-Muslim dissensions, had, among other things, suggested that a Committee should be appointed to invite representative opinion and investigate the whole question of the share of various communities in representation and in the public services and report its findings by a certain date. A large section of the Conference, however, seemed unwilling to tackle the question and the Conference dispersed after adopting certain resolutions based on tolerance and intercommunal accommodation with regard to religious beliefs, observances and propaganda.

When two months later the All Parties' Conference met, the adjustment of communal shares in representation and in public services was one of the subjects it had to deal with. But since the Conference had also to frame a scheme of Swaraj and devise means whereby all parties could unite with each other and work on the common platform of the Indian National Congress, it was soon felt that the only way to do any real business was to entrust the work to a representative Committee. Mahatma Gandhi had, in consultation with others, proposed a score of names for the membership of such a Committee but a scramble took place for inclusion in the Committee; and to the Mahatma the only safe course seemed to accept all nominations and to remove the inequalities resulting from such a haphazard 'selection' by authorising the Committee to co-opt other members from parties or communities inadequately represented.

The Committee was large enough already, and the addition of co-opted members made it, when it met at Delhi two months later, quite as large as the original Conference. This led to the selection of another Committee, still very unwieldy, for the purpose of adjusting communal shares, and of yet another and smaller Committee to consider and report on the scheme of Swaraj prepared by Mrs. Besant and some others working with her in her Convention. Little progress was made in the course of the discussions carried on by this latter Committee, for the whole thing appeared to be so unreal without any progress towards the adjustment of communal shares. The large

Committee appointed to adjust them led, as if inevitably, to a series of private and informal conversations, and ultimately to the adjournment of further discussions to the end of February.

THE THREAD-MILL TRIBE

From this bare chronicle of a barren series of meetings of large committees and small committees, of formal debates and informal conversations, each individual will draw conclusion according to his own individual temperament. The pessimists are no doubt in a majority, and they will naturally tell us that much valuable time has been wasted; and in all probability the Hindu pessimists will accuse the Mussulmans of being the obstacle in the way of a settlement, and the Mussulman pessimists will similarly accuse the Hindus. We are not pessimists ourselves; but to us, too, one thing seems plain enough, and it is this. Whatever Mahatma Gandhi and a dozen others of his way of thinking may think, the bulk of the Hindus and Mussulmans that assembled at Delhi a fortnight ago do not yet appear to us to feel utter detestation of India's present-day slavery which alone can compel them to adjust their communal differences without delay and to make a united demand for Swaraj. To us every day that passes without the attainment of Swaraj is a source of additional torture, and we confess we find hard to be patient with those whose interminable electorates of their own, in which they can be secure from being swamped by overwhelming majority, is in practice even worse than disfranchising them. For if they are disfranchised nobody could at least pretend to speak in their name and commit them to courses of which they do not approve. Let us only add that, like communal representation itself, separate electroatcs are needed only so long as the temptation on the part of majorities to misrepresent minorities or the mistrust of majorities on the part of minorities persits. When this temptation and this mistrust disappear, neither separate electorates nor communal representation itself are needed.

UNFETTERED CHOICE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Where communities differ from each other very widely and apprehend that their interests will not be properly looked after by other communities, to give them separate electorates of their own is nothing more than to allow the two parties in a law-suit each to choose its own advocate. It will not do if one of the parties is allowed to choose the advocates for both, even if the choice in the case of the advocate of the other party is limited and its advocate is to be chosen from among members of its own community. After all it is the party's *interests* that are to be represented and advocated, and not its creed. But in law-suits where each party is given the natural right to choose its own advocate, its choice is not fettered, and it is free to choose the best advocate of its interests from *any* community. Mussulmans choose Hindu advocates and attorneys, and *vice versa*, and nobody regards this as

unnatural. It is all a matter of confidence. We strongly urge that so long as Hindus and Mussulmans genuinely feel that they are like parties in a law-suit, and are therefore allowed to choose their representatives themselves without any interference from others, they should also be free to choose as their representative the man in whom they have the greatest confidence, irrespective of the creed he holds and the community to which he belongs. It is the freedom of choice that minorities need, and it is illogical to give it to them by means of separate electorates and restrict it by compelling them to choose their representatives from a single community. Mahatma Gandhi was a better and more trusted representative of the Mussulmans of India in the matter of the Khilafat than Mian Mohamed Shafi or even Mr. Jinnah. But we could also name a dozen leading Mussulmans who would more truly represent the Untouchables than an equal number of leading Hindus that we could name. A true Nationalist could love nothing better than so to win by his national service the confidence of all communities—other communities as well as his own—as to be returned by any communal constituency for which he chose to stand. The majority of the so-called Nationalists of today are suspect, so far as minority communities are concerned, because they spend far more time and energy in running down what they choose to call Communalism than in proving their own Nationalism by means of their national service. It is certainly better to work for the good than to rail at the evil.

EXCESSIVE REPRESENTATION

'Protection of minorities' is a principle that is generally conceded, but it must not be considered to be identical with the representation of minority communities in excess of their proportion in the population of the country. If the 14 or 15 per cent of the Muslim population in the United Provinces is allowed to return 30 per cent of the representatives, or the 19 or 20 per cent of the Muslim population of the Bombay Presidency, including Sindh, is allowed to return one-third of the representatives, the Muslim minority no doubt receives a measure of protection. One may concedes this even in the case of the 10 or 11 per cent of Bihar and Orisa returning 25 per cent of the representatives. But we fail to see how the 6 or 7 per cent Muslim population of Madras, or the 4 per cent Muslim population of the Central Provinces and Berar is protected, and that too in an 'adequate and effective' manner, by being allowed to return 15 per cent of representatives in each case.

No real injury can be apprehended to Hindu interests even if Muslim representation in all the provinces in which the Mussulmans are in a minority is raised in a Swaraj Government to one-third, as in the Bombay Presidency to-day. We can well understand if to-day, with an alien, bureaucratic Government, and the existing tension between Hindus and Mussulmans, quite a number of Muslim representatives in the Bombay Council do not follow the Nationalists into the division lobbies, and the leader of the Nationalists in the

Council would consequently think twice before agreeing to give to Mussulmans one-third representation in Bihar and Orissa, Madras and C.P. and Berar also *even under Swaraj.* But a generous gesture such as this would secure the confidence of the Mussulmáns all over India far more effectively than a hundred speeches on the virtues of Nationalism and on the benefit of Joint Electorates. Only, the Mussúlmans must remember that generosity cannot be had under compulsion any more than confidence, and if they cannot be compelled to repose confidence in the Hindu majority, the Hindu majority, too, cannot be compelled to be generous to them.

THE MIDDLE COURSE

In the present state of inter-communal feelings, the best thing to do, and the only one consonant with Muslim dignity is (a), to ask for clear-cut share of representation in exact proportion to population; (b) to leave it to the minority in every constituency to say whether it would have its representation secured to it through separate electorates or would trust to the justice of joint territorial electorates; (c) to protect the minorities by means of fundamental laws which no majorities could alter, and by means of a provision on the lines of the proviso in the Lucknow Pact, that no bill, nor any clasue thereof, nor a resolution affecting any community which question is to be determined by the members of that community in the elected body concerned shall be proceeded with if three-fourths of the members of that community in that body oppose the bill or any clause thereof or the resolution.

FUNDAMENTAL LAWS

The Unity Conference has already passed a number of resolutions which declare the rights of various communities and also the manner in which these rights can be exercised without infringing the rights of other communities and with due consideration for their feelings and sentiments. It should not be difficult to frame certain Fundamental Laws incorporating the decisions of the Unity Conference. Lala Lajpatrai has spent a great deal of energy in trying to prove that there is no such thing as an absolute right. Either this is a platitude the discussion of which would only serve to make the obvious obscure; or Lalaji has used his forensic talents to make the worse appear the better reason, and to deprive some people in India of rights which in other countries do not need even to be declared. Such abstract reasoning can be productive of no practical good, and if any community in India cherishes any rights which it cannot leave at the mercy of possibly hostile majorities, the proper course for it is to convince the representatives of various communities that they are its undoubted rights, and that they can be exercised without any infringement of the rights of others, and after that to have them embodied into Fundamental Laws.

THE PROVISO

It is not possible to foresee everything to-day; nor is it proper to multiply Fundamental Laws which cannot be altered except by the unanimous vote of the representatives of the entire nation. Therefore, a provision on the lines of the proviso of the Lucknow Pact, which we have suggested, should be included among the Fundamental Laws of the Constitution. We are told that although such a proviso existed in the Lucknow Pact, the Government entirely ignored it when framing the Government of India Act and the regulations made thereunder, while adopting the proportion of representation laid down in that Pact. From this we are asked to conclude that the Government will again ignore this proviso. With regard to this we may say that the Government ignored it in the framing of the scheme of Reforms not because there was any intrinsic difficulty in embodying it in the Constitution, nor in the interests of the majority community, but in its own interests, since it wanted to keep its own hands unfettered. In framing a Constitution for the Swaraj Government, we shall not be studying the convenience of the alien bureaucracy, but of the Indian Nation itself, and there is many a provision that the bureaucracy would like to ignore but which the Nation must insist upon, and this is one of those provisions. It is also said that each community will object to many a reasonable thing that other communities would like to enact or resolve, and thus the Nation would proceed no further on account of such communal obstacles. We must say, we do not foresee any such difficulty because we cannot believe that any community would be guilty of such wanton obstruction as is apprehended; but even if any community could be guilty of it, other communities could soon bring it to its senses by convincing it that two can play that game. The measure we have suggested provides its own corrective, and legislative deadlocks would before long compel the obstructing community to make its peace with other communities and use the proviso only in extraordinary cases, for which alone it is meant.

LOCAL BODIES AND UNIVERSITIES

Many of those who are opposed to communal representation urge that even if it is to be tolerated in Legislative Councils, it should not be extended to local bodies, and in no case to universities and other educational bodies. It seems to us that the whole discussion of communal representation is an obstacle race, and minorities seeking to safeguard their interest are being obstructed at every step. If communal representation is not only an evil, but a necessary evil, then it must be accepted everywhere that the necessity for it exists. And if the highly educated men that would be returned by the electorates to the Legislative Councils cannot be trusted to represent truly and faithfully the interests of minority communities or special interests, what expectation of such true and faithful representation can we have from the kind of men that are returned as representative to local bodies? To our

mind this desire to confine communal representation, which is obviously based on mistrust, to Legislative Councils, is the greatest condemnation possible of the men of light and leading in India. Like the question of separate electorates, we think the decision on the subject of having communal representation in local bodies or not should be left to minority communities in each constituency. Happy are the people who can do without it; but if they cannot do without it, no one else has a right to compel them to trust representatives selected for them by majorities which they regard as hostile. As for the universities, we see no reason to exclude them. It is as if misrepresentation or mistrust is the monopoly of the ignorant. The corruption of the best is the worst, and Indian degradation is largely due to the defective character of India's leading men. If cowardice, as the Mahatma thinks, is the besetting sin of a large section of the Hindus and ignorance that of the Mussulmans, then the greatest national benefactor is that Mussulmans who can give courage to the Hindus and induce them to shed their fear of the Mussulmans, and also that Hindus who can arrange to have Muslim children and youths educated in every increasing numbers can be able to reduce the existing Muslim ignorance. And yet in the Punjab where Hindu-Muslim tension is the greatest, one of the greatest grievances of the Hindus against the Mussulmans is that the Education Minister, who is a Mussulman, has been endeavouring to reduce Muslim ignorance by making it possible for a large proportion of Mussulmans to be admitted into the existing educational institutions financed by the State, though still in a smaller proportion than that of their population. In these circumstances who can say that the majority can be trusted to do justice to the minority in universities and other educational bodies. If it cannot be trusted in one case, it can be trusted in no case, and if it can be trusted in one case, it can be trusted in all.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Last but not least is the question of the adjustment of communal shares in public services. Were it merely a question of the loaves and fishes of office, even then there is no reason why the division of these loaves and fishes should not be fair to all communities. But since it is the public servants who execute the laws framed by the Legislature, to permit any community to monopolise the executive is just as bad as, if not worse, than permitting it to monopolise the Legislatures. The only question we have to settle is that, whereas selection of the legislators is left to the constituencies, and they are responsible for electing the most efficient persons for the job, what other body must select the executive. The whole subject of communal representation, mixed and separate electorates, reservation of seats, proportional representation and cumulative voting, has been discussed so often and so long only because it is agreed on all hands that a method should be devised which should, as far as possible, eliminate the chances of partiality in the selection

of legislators. How then can the selection of the executive be left to take care of itself, and no effort made to devise some scheme which would similarly eliminate the chances of partiality in this sphere? As a matter of fact, it is against the bureaucratic executive, which is the citadel of this alien bureaucracy, that the most determined onslaughts have been made by the fighters of the national movement and the bureaucracy, too, has been far more reluctant to agree to the Indianisation of the executive than to the Indianisation of the legislatures. The same appears to be true of the Hindu majority and precisely on the same old ground of greater efficiency. O Efficiency, Efficiency, what injustices and what jests are perpetrated in thy name! For the sake of efficiency itself, it is necessary to appoint an impartial Public Services Board, on which all communities should be adequately represented and which should see that all communities receive impartial 'patronage'. As for efficiency, the rule should be that for every grade of public service a certain minimum standard of literary qualifications, among others, should be fixed; but so long as the members of a community satisfy that minimum standard of education required for that particular grade of service, they should not be kept out merely because members of another community satisfy just a little higher standard, even though the former community is inadequately represented in the public service, while the latter community is represented in excess of its numerical proportion. Efficiency must be safeguarded in fixing the requisite minimum standard and adhering to it, and not by closing our eyes to the weakness of human nature which is well illustrated by our national proverbs :

> The blind man distributes sweets, and time and
> after time hands them over to his own kith and kin.

The alien bureaucracy has been doing nothing less than this and we have all condemned it. Can we condemn it any the less because a section of our own nation appears to be equally grasping and acquisitive ?

One word more and we have done. Lala Lajpatrai in his questionnaire circulated among Hindu associations and leading men does not forget to ask whether the re-distribution of provinces is advisable. The Congress has already re-distributed the provinces on the linguistic basis, and Mahatma Gandhi in his Presidential Address at Belgaum has made such a re-distribution one of his Twelve Points. But it is from the Punjab that we hear once more about the need of re-distribution, and that apparently on no basis at all except this that the Hindus consider it insufferable to remain in a minority in the Punjab. They would therefore minimise the apprehended effects of being in a minority for as large a portion of the Hindus of the Punjab as possible by dividing their Province into two, so that the largest possible section of the Hindus of the Punjab may be rid of Muslim 'dominance' even if all cannot escape that horrible fate. Now the Punjab is after all not a very large province as provinces go, and if any province is unwieldy it is the United Provinces. No division on a linguistic basis can, however, be made, there and

no Mussulman has yet devised a method of ridding the Mussulmans, whose ruling families had their habitation in the United Provinces, or Hindu 'dominance' in that province. It is very curious that the arguments on the one side or on the other lead us nowhere. They only serve to remind us of the tread-mill. They are not indolent, nor are they quiet. On the contrary, they are always busy, and often loud. But they only go round and round, and make no progress.

Impatience will not, however, serve any purpose, nor it is possible to obtain Swaraj merely by a few people's utterly detesting the present-day slavery of India. It is true that if an appeal is made by such people to the country at large, and the masses are told without any reservation or reticence what such people feel at heart about this tread-mill tribe of politicians, and how Swaraj is being delayed by their dilatory debates, the masses would lose much of the confidence that at present they mistakenly repose in such procrastinating politicians. But it will mean an open breach with them, and probably a fairly long fight which would be enough to absorb the energies and attention of the small group, that is yearning for Swaraj. There are worse things than war; even we may yet have to wage one against these wranglers. But war is certainly a great evil, and although we have been credited with a great deal of militancy, we would like to avoid it as long as we possibly can, and in the meantime to explore every avenue that may be hoped to lead to a reconciliation between the Hindu and the Muslim irreconcilables of to-day.

TRUST SWARAJ AND NOT COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION

Our own view is that nothing could be worse than the existing servitude of the nation, and that no second state of India can be worse than the first. Convinced as we are of this, we have no hesitation in telling the Mussulmans, that they will not be the losers if they make no stipulations whatever with the Hindus as regards the future, and make no provisions in the scheme of Swaraj for safeguarding their interests by means of communal representation. We do not say this because we trust every Hindu who talks of communalism as being incompatible with nationalism, while he still thinks that his food would be polluted if a Mussulman or a Christian or a Parsee touched it, and while he still regards fifty millions of God's creatures, whom he counts as Hindus, and whom he would use for all political purposes against non-Hindus, as Untouchable and in some cases even as Unapproachable. With the Vykom Satyagrah still going on, unaided and unassisted by the vast bulk of Hindus, merely for the recognition of their fellow-Hindus' right of way on what would be regarded as thorough-fares in any other part of the world, and with untouchability as strongly entrenched as ever in spite of all the clamour of Sangathan and Shuddhi, it is cant and hypocrisy on the part of a very large section of Hindus to talk of Nationalism and to rebuke those who give expression to the apprehensions they feel as regards the rights of minority communities or backward classes and who would devise safeguard for them

through communal and class representation. If, therefore, we strongly advise the Mussulmans to give up all thought of communal representation it is because we feel that the mentality of the Hindu majority, as indeed of the entire nation, is bound to change with the advent of Swaraj and the dawn of national freedom in India, and because we feel that if that mentality does not change for the better, the Mussulmans will still be able to wrest back the rights of their community from the majority if it continued to remain communal and monopolistic while pretending to be national and just to all. When a commodious ship with sufficient room for passengers and crew is sailing in smooth waters there is little temptation to push and hustle and use one's elbows too vigorously. Then the mail passengers smile and bow to the ladies and make room for them in the politest of manners and the crew is only too conscious of its own place and even subservient to the passengers. The real test of the passengers' chivalry and the crew's discipline comes only with the storm and the ship wreck when the own-boats are being lowered and launched on a turbulent sea. In such cases it sometimes happens that the captain has to pull out his revolver and, while shouting out the order: 'Women and children first !', has to stand ready to shoot down the first man, who would in his excessive selfishness and terror rush to the boats before his turn and create confusion. To-day we are experiencing a storm and in the scramble and for a seat in the boats, we have proved ourselves in only too many cases to be both undisciplined and unchivalrous. When Swaraj is established we feel that this scramble would cease, and politeness and good manners and a proper appreciation of our duties as well as of our rights, and of her people's rights as well as of their duties would return. With only crumbs from the tables of our rulers falling to the 320 millions of India's famishing population there is no wonder if we lack table-manners. But with the board groaning under the weight of good things to eat we can be trusted to acquire table-manners and to cease to scramble. Such is human nature, and it is this human nature that we must all trust even if to-day we do not trust Hindu nature or Muslim nature.

If, however, we ultimately find that we had been too trustful and that the majority disregards the rights of the minorities, there is no constitution on earth made by lawyer or layman that can prevent our demanding justice and getting it. In the last resort, the only constitution that matters is the constitution that God has given to each of us. This is the ultimate sanction behind every constitution framed by man. If justice cannot be obtained by counting heads, it may become necessary to cutting them, or, by adopting the more humane, but not less courageous method of Non-Violent Non-Co-operation and Civil Disobedience. The Mussulmans are suspected in some Hindu quarters of desiring to invite their co-religionists abroad to subvert the Swaraj Government and re-establish Muslim rule. Everything that is humanly possible has been done to remove this suspicion, and we trust it will not be revived again. But if the Hindu Majority itself converts Swaraj into Hindu Raj, pure

and simple. Mahatma Gandhi himself would readily admit that Mussulmans who do not share his religion of non-violence would be justified in seeking the aid of their brothers outside India to put an end to their slavery.

We have every hope that Swaraj will itself prove the sovereign remedy for all our national ills; but if these hopes are belied, there is nothing that can prevent the Mussulmans from seeking and securing justice through Civil War or through Civil Disobedience. If, therefore, they are unwilling to trust the future, which only means to trust to human nature and to trust themselves, that argues woeful political debility among the Mussulmans. With such debility what mere paper constitution can secure their rights to them permanently ? No matter what constitutional safeguards are provided to-day there is no security if, as we know, constitutions can be treated as mere scraps of paper.

THE HINDU ATTITUDE

Being Mussulmans ourselves, we have not hesitated to advise them to make no stipulations to-day about communal representation. But if we had been Hindus, we would have even more unhesitatingly asked the Hindus to agree to all that Mussulmans demanded. For after all the Mussulmans do not demand that the Hindu majority should in a single case be converted into a minority, and so long as majority rule is accepted, the Hindu position in all constituencies is safe enough. But if the Mussulmans have given proofs of political debility, the Hindus have shown no greater political virility. We entirely agree with those who do not like the idea of communal representation disfiguring the Swaraj Constitution of India. But a communal monopoly is worse than communal representation, and when majority rule is accepted by the minority, it is only right that the minority too should be credited with some abhorrence of communal representation. It does not increase a minority's faith in the majority's sincerity if a community enjoying the comfortable position of security that its majority gives it behaves as if it enjoyed a monopoly of the abhorrence of communal representation. With all the abhorrence that we feel with regard to communal representation, we cannot pretend to think that if it is allowed to continue for a short period after Swaraj is established, we shall never be rid of it. That would depend upon the treatment that the majority meets out to the minorities, and we cannot help thinking that morbid mistrust of communal representation argues on the part of the majority some mistrust of itself. It is not only the Mussulmans that have given expression to apprehensions with regard to the rule of the Hindu majority. Non-Brahmans in southern and western India have shown perhaps as great mistrust of the Brahmans, and Ramaswami Mudaliars are as much the *karma* of Satyamurtis as Fazl-i-Hussains are the *karma* of Lajpatrais. Communities can evade their *karma* in this world far less than individuals, and it seems to us that there is no help for it but for each generation to pay the penalty for the misdeeds of the previous generation and to act in such a manner as not to

penalise the next generation.

THE LUCKNOW PACT

It has been said on behalf of the Hindu community that if communal representation must remain, then the Lucknow Pact is the utmost limit which in such representation can be conceded. The *Comrade* had ceased to be published fully two years before the Lucknow Pact had been concluded in 1916, and we were in no way responsible for that Pact. Nevertheless we would have favoured its continuance even now that we were framing a Swaraj scheme were it not for the fact that in that Pact Bengal Mussulmans had been for the time being deprived of their majority and reduced to 40 per cent representation in spite of a Muslim population as high as 54 per cent. This sort of arrangement may be fair for a time, but it cannot be maintained in a permanent Swaraj Constitution. Apart from that, the reluctance of the Hindus to allow the Mussulmans to be in majority even in two provinces out of so many is to our mind extremely unsporting. The Hindu Mahasabha Committee was anxious that even if the All-Parties' Committee arrived at a conclusion which gave Bengal and the Punjab Muslims majorities to which their proportion of population entitled them, that conclusion should only be final until it was assured that the Central Government, in which the Hindus were, of course, in a majority, would retain control over these Provincial Governments. If the strong and even dominant Hindu minorities in the Punjab and Bengal can be so nervous with regard to Muslim majority there, then what wonder is it if Muslim minorities seek to safeguard themselves by means of communal representation ?

THE POPULATION BASIS & ADULT SUFFRAGE

There has been no little opposition to the adoption of the population basis for communal representation, and preference has been given to the basis of 'voting strength', which meant a property franchise. But we are glad that Lala Lajpatrai at least is willing to accept adult suffrage, and this is the best answer to croakers like Punjab's former Governor, Sir Michael O'Dwyer, who is always accusing the educated classes in India of neglecting the interests of the masses and of desiring to convert British autocracy not into an Indian democracy but into an Indian oligarchy. We strongly recommend that no property franchise should be proposed by Indians themselves, even if adult suffrage is for some reason not recommended. For our part, we favour adult suffrage and free and compulsory elementary instruction in order to 'educate our masters', after which some easy literary test may be imposed, since it would then encourage the spread of education of the illiterate and the ignorant, and not confine power in the hands of those already educated.

SEPARATE OR MIXED ELECTORATES ?

The question that has been debated at the greatest length, however, is

whether communal representation, even if tolerated, should be secured through separate communal electorates or through joint territorial electorates. Where the minority is too substantial to be swamped by the majority, we certainly think that it should be bold enough to agree to joint territorial electorates, and safeguards such as Proportional Representation with a Single Transferable Vote-or a system of Cumulative Voting may be utilized. Unfortunately these safeguards are generally very insufficiently understood, and those who recommend them should explain them to the minorities whose adequate representation they seek to insure. But we know of no method that can insure a small minority from being swamped by an overwhelming majority, unless it has a number of seats reserved for it, and voting takes place in separate electorates of its own. It is true that in times of communal tension, such as that we have been going through ever since the reaction in far off Punjab of the troubles in Malabar, candidates most hostile to the majority will be returned by the minority voting in separate electorates of its own. But that is the inevitable *karma* of a majority that provokes the hostility of the minority' and how is it worse than such a majority's swamping the minority in a joint territorial electorate, and returning, even when a certain number of seats are reserved for the minority some men of straw belonging to the latter but not in the least representing its views and wishes ?

The return of the most bigoted and the most narrow minded members by an infuriated minority in times of communal tension will at least provide a safety-valve for the feelings of the minority. But will the situation be improved if the majority community keeps sitting down of this safety-valve, and filis the seats reserved for the minority community with men belonging to it but not way representing it ? Such nominees of the majority, pretending to speak for the minority and going into the lobby at the heels of the majority, will still further provoke and exasperate the minority, and inter-communal relations, far from being harmonized, will be still further exacerbated. It must be remembered that a minority is after all a minority and no matter what you do for it, 'suffering is the badge of the tribe.' To deprive it even of minority representation by swamping it is to play the bully and the tyrant, and that is far less compatible with nationalism than communal representation of minorities secured to them through separate communal electorates.

Much of the Swarajist case that Council entry is necessary rests on the bitter experience of the first 'Reformed' Councils when, through the Self-Denying Ordinance passed by the Non-Co-operators, the Moderates had the entire field of representation left to themselves. Returned to the Councils, generally speaking, by the few voters whom they could persuade to come to polling booths, and unopposed by Non-Co-operation candidates, they spoke in those Councils as if they had a mandate from the entire nation and were entitled to speak in its name. There was no end to their assurance and self-complacence, and this more than anything else infuriated the impatient among the Non-Co-operators and led to the Swarajist revolt. At the last

election they swept the board in several provinces, and if the Non-Changers had not kept aloof, as they did, there would have been fewer Independents and still fewer Liberals than we still find in the Councils. This was because the Non-Co-operation majority actually existed in the country and had only abstained from going to the polls in 1920. But if the Non-Co-operators had not been in a majority in the country and only constituted small minority, Co-operators would have swamped them and Non-Co-operation would have been left totally unrepresented. In such cases the only thing that Non-Co-operators could have done would have been to go to the country and convert it to their own views. The question is, do we want minority communities to remain unrepresented unless they can swell their ranks by religious conversions ? Generally speaking, political convictions are not so deeply rooted as religious convictions, and quite a large number of voters sit on the fence and tumble down almost at the last moment on one side or the other according to the comparative force and effectiveness of the propaganda on the two sides. Religious propaganda is happily not of this kind, and we have already had sufficiently bitter experience recently of propaganda of this character carried on in the religious field among the Malkanas and elsewhere.

Source : The Comrade, February 1925.

13

ALL INDIA KHILAFAT CONFERENCE, KANPUR
24 December 1926

The All India Khilafat Conference opened its proceedings on the 24 December at 2 P. M. under the presidency of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. Prominent among those present were Maulanas Mahommed Ali and Shaukat Ali, Janab Yakub Hassan, Mr. Murtuza Sahib, Mahatma Gandhi, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Messers. S. Srinivasa Iyengar, A. Rangaswamy Iyengar and T. Prakasam. The proceedings commenced with prayers. A message of sympathy from Hakim Ajmal Khan was then read.

Fundamentally opposed views on the Hedjaz were expressed at the Conference on this day by Maulana Hasrat Mohani, Chairman of the Reception Committee, and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, President of the Conference. Some excitement was caused when the former spoke.

Maulana Hasrat Mohani, in welcoming the delegates, said the Turks had no power to end the Khilafat, which must endure so long as Islam existed. It was only the responsibility for the office that the Turks had refused to

assume. He held they were prepared to help the Khilafat. They had indeed already received a message through Dr. Ansari that the Turks after settling their internal difficulties would be able to undertake the responsibilities of the Khilafat. But the Turks insisted that it must be democratised, namely that the Khilafat be elected and be helped by a Council whose opinion be voiced through the chosen Khalifa. With the Turks refusing to have the Khilafat it must go to the King of Hedjaz or President of the Republic of Hedjaz. He would prefer the latter, though there seemed no immediate prospect of getting it.

Maulana Hasrat Mohani, however, held it was impossible to protect the Khilafat without the aid of Turkey, and therefore the strongest blow to the Khilafat was the English and French mandate over Iraq and Palestine. The speaker held that the only silver lining in Sheriff Hussain's career was that he refused to sign an agreement with Britain regarding the Jewish Home in Palestine, but what Sheriff Hussain refused to do has been readily done by Ibn Saud in the form of the Clayton-Ibn Saud agreement, thereby jeopardising the interests of Turks and Druses. Indeed, he held that this settlement opened the way for Britain to do a gross wrong to Turkey by securing the League's decision in her favour regarding Mosul.

Maulana Hasrat Mohani urged that the Central Khilafat Committee should cease to support Ibn Saud and should stand for a Republic in Hedjaz. For, if Ibn Saud once established himself in the Hedjaz, it would be impossible to have a Republican form of Government. After the formation of the Hedjaz Rupublic its head should act in Council and be declared Khalifa in Council, India being duly represented on this Council to consolidate the Khilafat. Efforts should be made to rid Syria, Palestine and Iraq of foreign control and establish direct contact between Turkey and the Hedjaz. He declared any one opposed to this programme should be repudiated. He asked the Central Khilafat Committee to rise above party factions, or it would lead to ruin.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in his presidential address, which was delivered 'extempore', first dwelt on the need for continuing and strengthening the Khilafat organisation. This body, he held, was the only 'bonafide' body representing Muslim opinion on the issues now troubling the Muslim world. To dissolve the organisation would be held a serious set back to their work.

The Hedjaz question was the most important. They should all have rejoiced at the downfall of the Sheriffian family and should applaud Sultan Ibn Saud's efforts. In this behalf the Central Khilafat Committee had already declared its abhorrence at demolition of some of the holy places. Ibn Saud had declared that he was for the inquiry done to the holy places in his absence and he had declared his willingness to abide by the opinion of theologists

and to afford facilities for repair. A Conference of Muslims of the world should be soon held. India should be properly represented on it. The Khilafat organization was representative of the Muslims in India.

Touching on the internal politics, Maulana Azad said the Khilafat Committees should ally themselves with the Congress organization for the furtherence of the national programme. The Khilafat Committee should have definite views on the question of Council-entry and the Maulana would himself advocate Council work. The Khilafat Committee should put forward its programme in clear and unambiguous terms. The Maulana laid stress on the political education of the people so that the desired end could be achieved.

MAHOMED ALI'S ATTACK ON MOHANI

After the Conference was over, the Khilafat demonstration was held late at night when several speakers addressed a large audience in the Khilafat Conference. Maulana Mahomed Ali spoke adversely on the speech delivered by Maulana Hasrat Mohani as Chairman of the Reception Committee in which Mohani Saheb had gone beyond his province on commenting upon various matters. Maulana Mohamed Ali held that they must not, as Maulana Hasrat had done, accept the newspaper rumour of the Clayton-Ibn Saud Agreement. Of course, if Ibn Saud behaved in the manner Sheriff Hussain had acted they should all oppose him too. But so far no definite proof was forthcoming about the Agreement. On the other hand, Ibn Saud had done well in turning out the Sheriffians.

As regards the necessity for the Khilafat Conference, he said, if the Turks had won their independence the Indian Khilafatists had in some small way made that possible by carrying on the agitation that it was 'haram' (sin) for the Muslim to kill a Muslim. This had prevented the Government in those days to send Indian troops to fight the Turks. The same situation might now arise, if the League's decision about Mosul was enforced. He prayed that the Turks might remain in possession of Mosul. The Khilafat Committee's activities would be required to prevent India being again asked to assist to turn out the Turks from Mosul. Moulana Mohamed Ali at this stage was handed over a cable just then received from the Khilafat Deputation which had gone to inquire into the true state of affairs in Hedjaz. He read it to the audience amidst applause.

The following is the test of the Cable which was published in newspapers under the caption : HOW ALI'S GARRISON SURRENDERED

'Emir Ali's Medina Garrison surrendered on the 4th of December. Ula on the 10th. Alwajh on the 13th and Tabuk and Zuba on the 14th. Governor Yamboo is reported to have fled. Troops are expected to surrender soon. Vast quantities of arms, ammunition, railway materials and five wireless apparatus fell into the Mejdis hands. Amir Mohammed entered Medina on

the 6th and we on the 10th and offered Juma prayers, all the Mejdis joining. The Amir presented robes to Imam.

'The reports of a crack in the dome of the Prophet's tomb is entirely false. A minute examination disclosed two stray bullet marks on the dome and one minaret, all from Ali's side headquarters. The Bedouins are hostile to Ali. The location of responsibility is impossible. The tomb and the dome of Sydna Hamza is uninjured. Only two of the ornamental tops of the iron railing surrounding the tomb and the portion of the pucca Tawiz Aqil's tomb next to Sydna Hamza (since restored) are injured. One raised platform facing the tombs known as Masjid Abuzar also suffered. Other tomb domes and historical monuments are quite safe.

'Quba and Hamza Mosques in the Mejdi's occupation zone were slightly hit by sharpnels from Ali's guns. Maghribi Bukhari and the Hindi houses near the city wall were destroyed by Ali's troops. Interviewed Abdul Majid, Ali's commander, justified their action. Reports of indecent search of women leaving Medina by Ali's soldiers, removal of carpets and money from Harem of Nabvi by Husain and Ali are confirmed by Shurafai, Medina Harem officials, Abdul Baqi, Farangimahali and others. Documentary proof of the offer of Medina to Transjordania by Ali's officials is available. Amir Mohammed are treating the Medinites with brotherly affection and providing relief but distress is acute and extensive. We are opening free kitchen with four thousand rupees under the Supervision Committee consisting of Shaikhul Hurem, President Municipality, Maulana Abdul Baqi, Farangimahali, Shaikh Mohammed Hussain, Samman Syed Mahmood Fyzabadi Mohammed and Husain Gabbad.'

Maulana Mohamed Ali after reading the telegram appealed for funds to relieve the distress in Medina. Rs. 337 were subscribed on the spot and more were promised.

PROCEEDINGS AND RESOLUTIONS
25–28 December 1925

The Khilafat Conference re-assembled next day on the 25th December. As Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was indisposed, Maulana Mohamed Ali took the chair.

The first resolution moved was regarding the Riffs whose valiant stand against the two mighty European Powers was referred to and their love of Islam and patriotism were applauded. The following resolutions were also passed :

'The All-India Khilafat Conference resolves that enlistment of volunteers in every district and province should be taken in hand with a view to execute with vigour the constructive programme of Khilafat organization :

'This Conference expresses its profound sympathy with its South African Indian brethren in their struggle for protection of their national and civic

rights, and assures them that every Indian fervently desires success to their cause and would do everything possible for them in their present condition of helpless slavery :

'The Conference invites the attention of all Khilafat workers to the critical and serious situation that has arisen and calls upon them to strengthen the Khilafat organizations in the various districts and provinces within the next three months of the coming year, if they do not want to kill the progressive spirit of national consciousness created by it in the Muslim community.'

IRAQ AND MOSUL

On the 26th December, the Conference re-assembled with Maulana Abul Kalam Azad presiding. The first resolution adopted, after several speakers had spoken, was regarding Iraq and Mosul. It was moved by Maulana Abdul Rahman and was seconded by Maulana Shaukat Ali. It reiterated the opinion of the Conference that from a religious point of view they could never accept foreign interference in the affairs of Jazirat-ul-Arab, that Iraq was a part of Jazirat-ul-Arab and that the present administration of Iraq was really British.

The Conference further held that the decision of the League on Mosul was not acceptable, inasmuch as it was against the understanding given by Lord Curzon on the occasion of signing of the Lausanne treaty that no decision regarding Mosul would be taken in defiance of the wishes of the Turks.

The Conference declared that if the Turks were consequently forced to a war, they would be justified in so doing, and that the Khilafat Conference would consider it its duty to help Turks.

Further that Indians should learn from the bitter experience of the last war and should not repeat the same mistake. If, therefore, a war arose on the issue of Mosul, the Conference would try to see that Indians did not render any help in men or money to the British Government.

BOMBARDMENT OF DAMASCUS

The next resolution condemned the brutal bombardment of Damascus by the French, expressed whole-hearted sympathy with the people of Syria in their struggle for freedom. This was moved by Maulana Suleman Sahib Nadvi and supported by M. Mohamed Ali.

The third resolution declared that Ukba and Muan were essentially a part of the Hedjaz and protested against any attempt by Britain to separate these from the Hedjaz.

MAULANA MOHANI'S ADDRESS EXPUNGED

On the 27th December, an important decision was taken by the Khilafat Conference to expunge from the official Khilafat documents the address which

Maulana Hasrat Mohani delivered as the Chairman of the Reception Committee. It was held that the address views opposed to the declared views of the Central Khilafat Committee and that the views condemning the Khilafat policy for the year had been made in the spirit of irresponsibility. Maulana Azad, President of the Conference, made it clear that in passing the resolution they should not mix up personalities with principles and should be guided solely by sense of responsibility and of loyalty to the Khilafat. They had to weigh on one hand the gravity of the issue at stake and on the other the consequences of being forced to deal with personalities. They could not allow such a document to form part of the Khilafat literature without causing grave misunderstanding.

Regarding the attitude of the Conference Maulvi Habibur Rahman said that the address had been condemned in moderate language and that the activities of Maulana Hasrat Mohani in connection with the Khudamul Harmain had made him forfeit their confidence. Islam was respector of no person, however great his past services, if he defied the Muslims in religious matters.

Another resolution of the Conference resolved to take steps to create an atmosphere for healthy annual pilgrimage to Hedjaz, to establish in case of necessity, Khilafat organization centres in Arabia.

On the 28th December, the Conference concluded its session after passing some more resolutions two of which were important namely, those relating to proposed settlement of Moplahs in Andamans and the liberation of Hedjaz.

THE MOPLAH SETTLEMENT

The resolution regarding Moplahs was adopted by the Conference on the motion of Yakub Hossain of Madras. It declared its resentment at the proposal of the Government of India to make Moplahs with their families settle down in Andamans for the reason that the Jails Committee had already declared against the island being made an abode of prisoners. Moreover, the Conference was opposed to Moplahs being sent away from their homelands to any country, however suitable. Further, the Conference feared, that as men number ten times the women in the island, this would have a very serious effect on the morals of Moplah prisoners and their children.

LIBERATION OF HEDJAZ

The Conference in the resolution about Hedjaz 'offers its congratulations to Ibn Saud on the peaceful entry of his forces in Medina and Jeddah and expresses its hearty gratification for complete liberation of Hedjaz from the tyrannical regime of the Sherifian Government. The Conference further affirms its full satisfaction and confidence in the policy of the Sultan regarding the future of Hedjaz as conveyed in all his declarations, and trusts that the whole Islamic world will welcome his invitation and an International Islamic Conference will soon meet to decide the future of Hedjaz. This Conference

resolves that the Central Khilafat Committee should widely proclaim in India that the present well ordered and peaceful conditions of Hedjaz provide all possible facilities for despatch and return of a very large number of pilgrims during the coming Haj season and may also open its offices at Jeddah or other places, if necessary, for the attainment of this object.'

THE PRESIDENT'S CONCLUDING SPEECH

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad delivered a brief spirited address in bringing to a close the proceedings of the Khilafat Conference. Referring to the main resolutions of the session passed, he said : These urge the Muslims to take the vow of earnest, uninterrupted, solid work for the performance of the duties that are binding on every individual. Nations have their duties in the same manner as have individuals. Corporate life can be illustrated by the example of bricks and walls. Bricks not joined together can be picked off easily, but once they are joined together—that is, a relation is established (on solid foundation) between each of these—a blow to the bricks would result in injury to one's own feet. This difference was created through a change of relationship. When one brick was put in such a position as to help and support the others, it was made infinitely more strong than it originally was, when it was deprived of the support of others. For nations there are fixed codes of conduct, deviation from which renders them weak, helpless and morally and politically degenerated and deformed. The Indian Muslims are a hopelessly divided and disorganized people--a flock of slaves, a herd of men no better than cattle, neither of use for itself nor of any benefit to the community at large. India's independence cannot long be withheld now but our shameful indifference to our duties and our disregard of the most fundamental political demands might postpone it and the responsibility is great, if we feel that we are retarding the progress of a people and advancing towards Swaraj.

'There is an auspicious change in Hedjaz. The land of Arabia has been purged of a great tyrannical administration. From the very first Sultan Ibn Saud had made his policy and position clear and unambiguous. He had declared that he was not seizing Hedjaz for establishing control over it. After the autocratic atrocities of Hussain, he was inviting representatives from different countries to decide the future of Hedjaz. There is no possibility of any further doubts as regards his intentions. Past events are proofs conclusive on this vexed question. Those who have eyes can see things clearly and in their true perspective. It was a great mercy that the Almighty showered on us when after ten years of shameful mismanagement and disorganization that was rampant in the very heart of Arabia and which was the cause of much sorrow and suffering, a man came forward to liberate that Holy Land. For full ten years that tyrannical Government of Sharif Hussain was supreme in Hedjaz, in spite of the declared wishes of forty crores of Mussulmans of the world to the contrary. During the course of these thirteen hundred years there has not been an evil of such portentous magnitude than the reign of the

Sherifian family. The devastation of Damascus was but a natural corollary to that evil.'

'The Mosques should be educational centres for Muslims. Unless a change is sought to be effected in the daily life of a Muslim, no useful results are likely to accrue. Orphanages should also be established where there is need for them. The Khilafat Committee should fix three months for collecting, if necessary, funds required for carrying on its work and the rest of nine months to actual completion of the work taken in hand. This will ensure economy of time. Energies will thus not be frittered away in unuseful direction. On an appropriate occasion the Committee shall be accountable for a fixed quota of work undertaken at the beginning of the year. It shall have to fulfil the promises it made at the beginning of the year and provide the much-needed religious education of the Muslims. This would mean enlightenment and education in its truest sense on every seventh day. This refinement of mind would thus be repeated with unfailing regularity. This would be establishing an educational institution, as it were with the minimum expenditure of energy.'

Source : The Indian Quarterly Register, July–Dec. 1925, Vol. II.

14

TANZIM CONFERENCE, ALIGARH
29 December 1925

The first sitting of the Tanzim Conference was held in the Jubilee pandal, Aligarh, on December 29, 1925, with an attendance of about 4,000. The president was Maulvi Abdulla Yusaf Khan. Mahommed Yusuf Ali (Aligarh), Chairman of the Reception Committee, complained of the agitation against Tanzim and said that Tanzim meant only that Mahommedans were organizing their scattered community; it had no political significance. Sir Ali Imam said that Tanzim would strengthen the Mahommedan community and could achieve what the Muslim League, Khilafat and the Educational Conference could not do. Abdul Majid (Budaun), Nawab Sir Abdul Qayum Ali Mahommed spoke in favour of Tanzim. Saiyid Kalbe Abbas promised the support of the Shia community. Abdulla Yusuf Ali in his presidential address said that the idea of Tanzim or organization was not a new one. Tanzim was not a reply to Hindu movements, but a strengthening of the Muslim national life. The organization was not hostile to the Khilafat leaders; it was intended to help education and to further Tabligh—the preaching of the faith; its social programme was to help the widow and orphan and to raise the outcaste and despised; it aimed at the building of new mosques, the establishment of waqfs and co-operative societies and the encouragement of science, trade,

commerce and arts. Dr. Kitchlew, Secretary, reading his annual report said that about 40 Tanzim committees had been established in various districts in a little over a month. He explained that Tanzim was non-political whereas the Hindu Mahasabha was most distinctly political, taking part as it did in municipal and other elections and putting up candidates to oppose swarajists and congressmen. Muslims, he said, did not interfere with Hindu reform and Hindus ought not to object to Tanzim.

The second sitting of the Tanzim Conference was held on 29 December 1925; attendance about 2,000. Maulvi Abdulla Yusuf Ali was in the chair. Abdul Majid (Budaun) moved a resolution recommending the establishment throughout the country of Tanzim committees, which should be affiliated to the Central Tanzim Committee, Amritsar, and said that organization was necessary for progress and prosperity. He spoke of the madness of Lala Har Dayal and other Hindu leaders who said that Mahommedans should either leave India or live there as slaves, and declared that Mahommedans would never be driven out of India and that they had come here not to be slaves but to become kings. He described the object of the movement and said that the members of the Tanzim committee would undergo physical training in order to fit them for self-defence in case of disturbance. Saiyid Tufail Ahmed, Maulana Fakhir, Hasrat Mohani, Dr. Abdulla Sherwani (Bengal) and Mirza Qasim Beg Chughtai supported the resolution. Hasrat Mohani suggested that the Tanzim committees should have general control over Muslim affairs, while the Khilafat should control foreign and the Muslim League home political activities. The second resolution moved by Dr. Kitchlew was that a centre for the training and preparation of volunteers for Tanzim work should speedily be established. He declared that Tanzim would bind together all Muslim sects, would spread education and help trade. He urged all Mahommedans to join the movement as otherwise it might be difficult for them to continue to live in India. The resolution was passed unanimously. Khan Bahadur Hafiz Hidayat Husain, M.L.C., moved the third resolution asking for financial help from rich men who should be asked to contribute to a central treasury and so assist the poor and helpless. Amir Hasan Khan, Government Pleader, Fatehpur, recommending the organization of a permanent sub-committee to manage the Tanzim treasury said that Hindus by monopolizing the trade of the country had been able to overwhelm and crush Mahommedans.

At a meeting of the Tanzim subjects committee held on 28 December 1925, Mahommed Fakhir proposed that sub-committees should be warned not to take part in election campaigns. His proposal met with little support and when put to the vote was thrown out. An unknown member from Panipat proposed the boycott of Hindu shops and traders, but Muhammad Ehtesham Ali said that Mahommedans were not yet ready for this boycott; they should enter into competition with Hindus and later on ruin them by a boycott. It was decided to start a training school for Tanzim workers, who, after their

course of training, should be employed as paid agents of the Tanzim committee.

Source : Home Dept. (Political), 1925, F. No. 10/II/25-Pol.

14

THE SEVENTEENTH SESSION OF THE ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE, ALIGARH, 30 December 1925

The 17th Session of the All-India Muslim League opened at Aligarh on the 30 December, Sir Abdur Rahim presiding. The President-elect entered the Pandal in a procession. Among those present were Sir Mian Mahommed Shafi, Sir Ali Imam, Mr. Jinnah, Maulana Mahommed Ali, Maulana Shaukat Ali, Seth Yakub Hussain, Dr. Kitchlew, Seth Mohani, Mr. Asaf Ali, Ali Nabi, Mr. Tasadduq Ahmed Khan Sherwani, Dr. Abdur Rahim and Mr. Sorabji Rustamji of the South African Delegation.

Sheikh Abdullah, Chairman of the Reception Committee, welcomed the League to Aligarh, the place of its birth.

Mr. Jinnah in inviting Sir Abdur Rahim to take the chair said that Sir Abdur Rahim became famous when he was first appointed Member of the Royal Commission by writing his note of dissent. He was an upright Judge on the Bench of Madras High Court. After that he transferred his activities to the bureaucratic camp where he was a power. As a member of the Bengal Executive Council he rendered them many services which did not see the light of the day. The situation in India, he declared, was more serious than he had known during his lifetime. He felt no doubt that under the able guidance of Sir Abdur Rahim and by the co-operation of all who had assembled there the League would achieve results which would not only benefit the community but India as a whole. They desired unity in India between the different communities and the first step to this desideratum was to bring about unity among themselves.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

In his lengthy presidential address Sir Abdur Rahim reviewed the position of Indian Mussulmans and made some practical suggestions for advancing their co-religionists and criticised a section of Hindu politicians whose mischievous activities according to him were a serious challenge to Islam and a grave menace to the political status of Mussulmans. He supported the proposal for communal electorates not only for Mussulmans but also for English-

men and advocated the formation of a solid Muslim Party in the Legislatures as an essential and foremost need of the situation and without which he feared the political ruin of the community would be brought about by their own men.

He suggested the appointment of a strong committee fully representative of different communities and interests to investigate the entire position in regard to the question of making Provincial Governments entirely responsible to the legislature and ascertain the opinions and desires of the people on as large a scale as possible in the different concrete political and administrative problems that might arise and then recommend a constitution which would meet the requirements of the situation. He dwelt on the political importance of the Muslim League and deplored the attacks on Muslim community in the form of Suddhi, Sangathan and Hindu Mahasabha movements and activities led by politicians like Lala Lajpatrai and Swami Shraddhanand. Some of the Hindu leaders had spoken publicly of driving out Muslims from India as Spaniards expelled Moors from Spain. Mussulmans would be a too big mouthful for their Hindu friends to swallow. Thanks to the critical conditions under which they lived they had to admit that Hindus were in a position of great advantage and even the English had learnt dread their venomous propaganda. Hindus were equally adept in the art of belittling in every way possible the best Mussulmans in public positions excepting only those who had subscribed to the Hindu political creed. They had in fact by their provocative and aggressive conduct made it clearer than ever to Muslims that the latter could not entrust their fate to Hindus and must adopt every possible measure of self-defence. Muslims must tell these politicians frankly and explicitly that their claim that India belonged solely to Hindus was preposterous and unfounded and was unjust to India itself.

Anyone who was at all acquainted with the history of the Muslim races throughout the world would never deny that they were the greatest patrons of human talent, energy and enterprise without any consideration of race, colour or creed. Politicians should realise that it would be impossible to establish Self-Government without Muslim help.

He criticised the Swaraj Party and its incongrous mixture and said that unless Swarajists made up their minds definitely to free their party from the influence of monopolists and capitalists, it was not possible for them to act as a genuine People's Party. He defended the accusation against Mussulmans that their patriotism was not wholly confined to this country and said Mussulmans are proud of their international outlook and India would have been a happier country if she was not embarrassed by caste and untouchability. He sympathised with the gallant Riffs and brave Drušes. The most disquieting news to him was the award of the League of Nations on Mosul question. The decision was pregnant with sinister possibilities affecting the relations between England and Turkey and he fervently hoped that matters would not be pushed beyond limits of friendly negotiations.

Referring to the Hindu-Muslim problems, Sir Abdur Rahim declared that it would perhaps be years before a substantial fusion of the two peoples came about and probably it would be as a result of some general social upheaval. He instanced the position of Mussulmans in Bengal, their past glory and their present abject position and pleaded for reconstruction of the community. English and Bengali were substituted for Persian and Urdu and in one generation Muslims were swept out of the administration. The motive was mainly political though it was supported on administrative grounds.

After dealing with the great value of Mussulmans to India, he narrated his own experience in public positions and acknowledged without reserve that he had much to learn from his English colleagues at every stage of his career and he would have been a great looser if he had not the advantage of working with them. Most of the progressive measure were initiated by Englishmen themselves and he could not recall a single occasion when there was an agreement on any question among Indian members for a substantial fusion of the two of the Executive Council. Their opinion was disregarded. If the Indian point of view had not prevailed on any question where it should have then it must be attributed more to the weakness of Indian members and Ministers than anything else.

As regards Indians in Government, it was alleged that the system was such that an Indian majority in Government could not enforce their views. Even without any formal rules enunciating joint responsibility there was nothing to prevent all members of Government in any province acting together in enforcing their views if the Governor overruled any of them or all of them in any measure of importance. He emphasised the necessity that the Imperial Conference should be given a constitution in which India would have an honoured and equal place and he looked forward to the time when the League of Nations would become a greater League of Humanity. India, he said, was far off from the ideal of responsible Government in this essential respect that her electorate was not educated that it would be years before every man and woman would have a vote. Nor was it possible under present circumstances to have one common general electorate.

Subject to these limitations, the present constitution should be modified for securing political and economic progress of the country unhampered. He also referred to the useful work of the Khilafat Committee and Tanzim and pleaded for a common language and common name for Indian people. He had no objection for Hindi with this compromise that Mussulmans would use Arabic Script.

PROCEEDINGS AND RESOLUTIONS

ROYAL COMMISSION

The second sitting of the All India Muslim League commenced on the 31st morning, Sir Abdur Rahim presiding. The following resolution was

moved by Sir Ali Imam :

'Whereas the speedy attainment of fully responsible Government is one of the declared objects of the League and it is now generally felt and recognised that the conception of Swaraj should be translated into the realm of practical politics and whereas it is the declared policy of the British Government also to enable the people of India to take a decisive part in the moulding of their own destinies which is marked by the declaration of August 1917, and the enactment of 1919 which formed a definite epoch in the history of India, as a herald of the time when India will possess full autonomy and will rank as an equal with the dominions and with the United Kingdom itself as a member of the British Commonwealth, the All-India Muslim League is of opinion that the present constitution of India must be amended and urges that for this purpose the Government should undertake the revision of the Government of India Act 1919 and without any delay appoint a Royal Commission to formulate after due enquiry and investigation a scheme so as to place the Indian constitution on a sound and permanent basis with provisions for automatic progress to establish fully Responsible Government in India and thereby secure stability in the Government and the willing co-operation of the people, provided however, that for any scheme of the future constitution of India the All-India Muslim League reaffirms and unequivocally declares that the following basic and fundamental principles must be secured and guaranteed, viz., (1) legislatures of the country and other elected bodies shall be constituted on the definite principle of adequate and effective representation of minorities in every province without reducing the majority in any province to a minority or even to an equality, (2) the representation of communal group shall be continued by means of separate electorates as at present provided that it shall be open to any community at any time to abandon its separate electorate in favour of joint electorate, (3) any territorial redistribution that might at any time be necessary shall not in any way affect the Muslim majority in the Punjab, Bengal and the North-West Frontier Province, (4) full religious liberty of belief, worship, observance, propaganda, association and education shall be guaranteed to all communities, (5) no bill or resolution or any part thereof shall be passed in any legislature or in any other elected body if three-fourths of the members of any community in that particular body oppose such bill or resolution or part thereof on the ground that it would be injurious to the interests of that community, or in the alternative, such other method is devised as may be found feasible and practicable to deal with such cases.'

In commending the resolution to the League, Sir Ali Imam said that the present constitution was considered to be unsatisfactory because it did not give sufficient scope for proper expression of their political aspirations. Reforms were short in one thing that they had not in truth conferred upon the country Self-Government. They wanted reforms which must secure Self-Government. The appointment of the Royal Commission should be declared

as it would be a legal step for the authorities in England to take. There should be no delay in the appointment of the Royal Commission as the wasting would only mean sheer loss of time.

It was in the interest of good Government that the people should not feel disappointed as regards the appointment of the Commission. Hope deferred would make the heart sick. If there was delay of this kind it might endanger the position in India as there was an idea for separation from British Empire. If their place was going to be of an equal partner in the Empire, then and then alone, they could be content. So much for the preamble of the resolution. As for the provisos obvious justice was contained in the provision for adequate and effective representation of minorities in the legislatures. Experience has shown how a sectarian majority could be of a wicked nature and a perpetual minority had always to bear from it in provinces where they had got a majority. That majority should in no way be reduced, but maintained. As to the representation of communal groups, he said that he had always felt a repugnance for separate electorates, the reasons being that no country could take long strides towards political advancement without joint action. He wished that the condition did not exist in India for separate electorates. The deplorable fact was that the country was so placed racially that it was incomprehensible to do without separate electorates. It was a necessary evil according to him so far as the principle of separate electorates was concerned. It favoured both the communities wherever they were in a minority. He hoped and trusted that all these little rivulets and streams would grow into an united river of Indian nationalism. In these circumstances they would not help resorting to this sort of scheme and that would ultimately lead to harmony after which they were hankering. The most strategic provinces were Bengal, the Punjab and the North West Frontier Province, the last being a province which though looked upon as backward province was going to play an important part in the history of India. It was a province of the greatest possible value to the whole of India. Behind all their beautiful and progressive scenes they had to consider as to who would keep the peace. In order to maintain the peace of the country it was essential that the frontiers must be protected from foreign aggression.

Shahibzada Aftab Ahmed Khan seconded the resolution.

MOHAMMED ALI'S AMENDMENT

Maulana Mohammed Ali moved an amendment to the resolution which ran as follows :

'Whereas Swaraj is our birth right and the existing Government of India provides a constitution for India which falls far short of Swaraj and is extremely unsatisfactory, the All-India Muslim League calls upon the Government to invite a Round Table Conference of the representatives of all communities and political parties in India in terms of the demand made in

February 1924 by the Legislative Assembly for the purpose of framing the constitution of Swaraj Government to be brought into force in the manner would be based on the following principles for the protection of minorities : (1) that all communities shall have representation in all elected bodies as far as possible in proportion to their members; (2) that minority communities shall have their representation secured to them in every elected body by means of separate electorates, provided that it shall be open to a minority community in any elected body at any time to abandon its separate electorates in favour of joint electorates; (3) that no territorial redistribution shall affect the existing majority of any community in any province without its own consent; (4) that religious liberty, *i.e.* liberty of religious belief, worship, observance, association, propaganda and education shall be guaranteed to all communities; (5) that no Bill or resolution or any part thereof shall be adopted by any legislative or any other elected body if three-fourth of the members of any community in that particular body oppose such Bill or resolution or part thereof on the ground that it would injuriously affect their community.'

AMENDMENT RULED OUT

The President ruled this amendment out of order as it was a substantive resolution in itself and it was not placed before the Subjects Committee.

Maulana Mohammed Ali then opposed the original resolution. He said that the resolution was full of short-comings. They should not demand a Royal Commission, but Hindus and Mussulmans should sit together and frame a constitution for India. He was of opinion, that the existing majority of any community should be maintained and that the representation should be based on proportion to numbers of each community.

Mr. Jinnah supporting the resolution asked them to concentrate their minds on the realities and facts placed before them. He referred to the speech of Lord Birkenhead in which His Lordship had remarked that they were not the slaves of dates and that all political parties in India should first hold a Round Table Conference among themselves and then frame a constitution for India. The speaker maintained that if all the people of India were agreed on a constitution then no Government could resist the demand for Self-Government. He asked them to come to an agreement between themselves first. The only issue between the Government and the people was that the present constitution be revised and that a scheme be formulated for putting the constitution on a permanent basis with provisions for automatic progress.

The resolution was put to the vote and carried by an overwhelming majority.

REFORMS IN THE FRONTIER

Mr. Abdul Aziz of Peshawar next moved a resolution :

Urging upon the Government the imperative need to give effect to the majority report of the Frontier Enquiry Committee without further delay and

asked the members of the Central Legislature and the Punjab Legislative Council to make efforts and press the Government to carry out the recommendations of the Frontier Enquiry Committee.

He went into the history of the question and asserted that the Chief Commissioner's plea in reply to the Muslim Deputation on the ground that the Hindus were opposed to the extension of Reforms to the province was untenable.

Sir Ali Imam in seconding the motion said that it was their duty to serve the province to their utmost. The geographical position of the province being such as it was, if the Reforms were not extended, it might create difficulties for the future self-governing India and progressive Afghanistan. It was necessary, therefore, he held that in the interest of defence of India the North-Western Frontier Province must be allowed to develop itself. This would create a feeling of affection in the minds of the frontier people for the rest of India. It would be a political blunder not to extend to them the Reforms which they demanded.

Maulana Mohammed Ali supporting the resolution said that their demand was just. He was surprised at the attitude of Sir Denis Bray who held one view as the President of the Frontier Enquiry Committee and quite another in the Council of State representing the Government.

After further discussion the resolution was unanimously adopted.

3RD DAY—1 JANUARY 1926

At the last meeting of the League on the 1 January, the following resolutions were passed.

REFORMS AND CO-OPERATION

Mr. Jinnah moved a resolution that although in the opinion of the League the present constitution was unsatisfactory the Muslim representatives in the various legislatures should utilise the Reforms as far as they want and in view of the appeal of Lord Birkenhead and Lord Reading should show a spirit of co-operation in all measures calculated to advance the welfare of the people of Indla pending enquiry and investigation by Royal Commission whose appointment the League had already urged.

In a learned speech he said that he wanted the League to express its opinion on this question. He was not prepared to ask the Muslims to resort to civil disobedience. He urged upon them to show a spirit of co-operation in the measures which would benefit the people of India.

Mr. Asaf Ali seconded the resolution. The motion was put to the vote and carried.

IRAQ AND MOSUL

In another resolution, which was unanimously adopted, the League emphatically declared that Iraq was a part of the Jazirat-Ul-Arab and as such

should not be left under non-Muslim control of the British as the mandatory power and that the Muslim League protested against the recent decision of the Council of the League of Nations which offered to the British an extention of their mandate over Iraq for 25 years. The Muslim League further protested against the Mosul decision of the Council of the League of Nations as a glaring injustice to Turkey and hoped that Britain would recognise the right of Turkey to the Mosul Vilayet and settled the question by peaceful negotiation. In the event of war breaking out, the League considered that the feelings of the Mussulmans of India were calculated to be inflamed beyond control throughout the country and might prove a great and serious disaster.

A resolution moved by Dr. Ziauddin Ahmed to the effect that while it was necessary to fix a suitable standard of educational qualification for the different services and appointments, the League was of opinion that it was extremely undesirable in the best interests of the people to place undue emphasis on the principle of competitive examinations at the expense of other considerations having an important bearing on the needs of an administration was adopted.

THE ASIATIC BILL

Before the resolution on the South African question was moved, Dr. Abdur Rahman of the South African Deputation was given the opportunity of explaining the position of Indians in South Africa. The speaker said that for the last twenty years the Indians in South Africa had their grievances and no relief was offered to them. Their rights were curtailed and their privileges abridged to such an extent that life to the Indians there had become intolerable. He than referred to the Areas Reservation Immignation and Registration Bill and pointed out the disabilities to which they would be subjected under it. They would not be permitted to trade, to live outside certain areas, to purchase property outside those areas and to take charge of a machine. They could not sit in the Parliament and had no political or municipal franchise. He was dissatisfied with the reply which the Viceroy gave to the Deputation. He considered the Bill not only a stigma, but an insult to the intelligence of India. If their demand for a Round Table Conference to bring about a settlement of the question was not acceded to by the Union Government, they would resort to passive resistance and it was going to be a fight of East against West.

The following resolution was moved by Mr. Asaf Ali and adopted unanimously :

'The All-India Muslim League whole-heartedly supports the Indian settlers of South Africa in their just and honourable struggle against the consolidated forces which threaten their very existence and extends its most cordial welcome to the South African Indian Deputation now in India. The League views with the greatest apprehension and enters its emphatic protest

against the Areas Reservation and Immigration and Registration (further provision) Bill which the Government of the Union of South Africa proposes to pass during the next session of the Union Parliament. The League further urges upon the Government of India to make a strong representation to the Union Government and secure a Round Table Conference before and further action is taken by the latter in respect of the proposed Bill, and should this reasonable proposal be declined and the Bill forced through the Union Parliament the Muslim League appeals to the Imperial Government to withhold its assent and disallow the measure.'

Among other resolutions passed by the League was one related to the appointment of a Committee to frame a scheme for constitutional advance to be placed before the Royal Commission when appointed.

The other resolution dealt with the deplorable bitterness of feeling existing between the Hindus and Mussulmans in different parts of the country and the constitution of conciliatory boards consisting of representatives of all communities with a Central Board in the capital of each province to settle all matters likely to create communal differences and to deal with all cases of conflict and enquire into the acts of aggression on the part of any particular community.

The next resolution protested against the government attempt at the colonisation of Moplah prisoners in the Andamans and urged upon the Government to set free the Moplah prisoners convicted during the Moplah Revolt of 1921.

Another resolution supporting the Mussulmans of Bihar and Orissa in their demand for option to present their pleadings in the courts in that province in the Urdu script and in their demand for extension of the system of separate electorates to all local bodies in that province was passed.

A resolution urging upon the government the necessity of allotting two seats to the Delhi province in the Assembly, one of which should be reserved for the Mussulmans and one seat to it in the Council of State, was adopted unanimously.

Sheikh Abdul Majid moved a resolution to the effect that Sindh should be separated from the Bombay Presidency. The resolution was carried with a vote of thanks to the chair. The Session then came to an end.

Source : The Indian Quarterly Register, July-December 1925, Vol. II.

15

MOHAMMAD ALI ON HINDUS AND MUSSULMANS

My attention has been drawn to the Right Hon. V. S. Srinivas Sastri's article in the *Servant of India* on Hindus and Muslims and to his reference to my supposed 'going back after a few years of nationalism' to my 'original separatist attitude', whereby in Mr. Sastri's opinion I have 'sharply and decisively sundered myself from my passionately-loved Guru'. Liberalism generally is, alas, so unrelated to the realities of Indian politics, and the Right Honourable Srinivas Sastri in particular lives in a world of his own so detached from that of ordinary mortals like me, that I am not surprised at his bracketing me with those great luminaries of the Muslim League, Sir Abdur Rahim, Mr. Jinnah and Sir Ali Imam. At best I am the stick that was destined to descend to mother earth of the rocket that vainly tried to light up for a time the Muslim League firmament.

In a sense I was a separatist and a communalist when Mr. Jinnah was a Nationalist, because the Hindu politicians of the so-called National Congress of those days were communalists masquerading as Nationalists, and I mistrusted them more than the English. The Guru whom I own I passionately love made the Congress for the first time truly 'National', because his nationalism, in spite of his ardent Hinduism, did not exclude the Mussulman nor ignored his miseries, and his nobler patriotism changed the political face of India.

Alas, he has lost his hold on a large number of Hindus before whom he had placed on his own person a truer ideal of nationalism than they ever had before. The result is that communalists are once more masquerading as Nationalists in this freak nation in which three Hindus will not even touch the fourth Hindu, and almost all display a separatism such as the world has nowhere and never seen. Let Hindus cast out this beam from their own eye before pointing out the mole in the Muslim eye. If a foreigner was to hear the Hindus' complaints of Muslim separatism, he would never imagine that they followed such a disintegrating and denationalising system as the caste with its untouchability and unapproachability. Physician cure thyself, is what a Mussulman is tempted to say. If a Mussulman fears the Hindu majority, is there any wonder ? Why, in Mr. Sastri's own South to which his Aryans had driven the original Dravidian stock even the Hindu majority Non-Brahmins mistrusts the Hindu minority of Brahmins and has politically separated itself from them.

Nevertheless, for my own part I am willing to trust not the Hindu

majority, but our common human nature, and a whole year ago I wrote, if Mr. Sastri only knew, and I unhesitatingly repeat today, that I not only do not want separate electorates, but do not want communal representation either. The present scramble for posts and seats in which the educated and wealthy Hindu majority has made an exhibition of no less greed and selfishness than the less educated and poorer Muslim minority, is but the result of our common hunger when only the crumbs from the tables of an alien bureaucracy fall to our lot. The famine-stricken must be excused if they know no table manners. But when we are free to eat the good things served on the table, we shall learn soon enough all the table manners we need, and instead of scrambling for little bits of food, shall know how to pass on dish after dish to those dining with us with the politest *opres vous* of Paris.

But if then, too, Mr. Sastri's community would not allow a non-Brahmin's, or at least a non-Hindu's shadow to fall on the food and would reserve everything for itself, then my community, which did not so much as say 'By your leave' when it first carved out an empire for itself in India, would know how to secure its proper communal share in its motherland. If Hindus still remain Hindus, as most of them are to-day, and do not become Indians and behave as Indians, then the Mussulmans would not need to apologise if they too act as Mussulmans only and obtain assistance from every Mussulman who is ready to come to their rescue.

It is not the Mussulman but the Hindu and the Brahmin that has been the arch-separatist and the arch-monopolist of History. But I want the Mussulmans in India to show that to be a good Mussulman is not to be a bad Indian. I want them to trust human nature, and win, if they have it in them, the leadership of India by serving her and her Hindu sons too with a devotion second to that of none. To be a Mussulman first is to place God's commands above those not only of a king, but also those of a narrow-minded community that would like to take for itself what is not its own but that of another. To be a Mussulman first is to be just first, and in that sense to be a Mussulman first is to be a Nationalist and an Indian first, and it is only in this sense, and none other, that I am a Mussulman first, and I believe my Guru to be a Hindu and a Vashnav first, and everything else afterwards.

As I have said, I want neither communal representation nor separate electorates, and while giving my own vote in a purely territorial electorate to my Guru, Mahatma Gandhi, whose honesty even as a Mussulman representative I trust far more than that of many an eminent Mussulman, I for my part intend so to serve my Hindu compatriots as to earn their confidence in an equal measure with any living Hindu, not excluding Mr. Sastri himself, so that if I seek election from a Hindu electorate I could secure it in preference to Mr. Sastri too.

But if the Mussulmans cannot trust the Hindu majority and the actions of many Hindu leaders to-day are the greatest creators of this Muslim

mistrust then I would certainly prefer separate electorates to joint electorates so long as this mistrust lasts, and so long only. And it is more logical for a Mussulman to prefer 15 per cent representatives of his own choice to 30 per cent representatives of another's choice, who will naturally not represent him, but will represent him who has chosen them.

I will go further, and say that if the Hindus concede everything that even the resolution of Sir Ali Imam demands, which I opposed and did not support, as Mr. Sastri perhaps imagines they stand to lose nothing by this generous gesture, for their large majority is everywhere safe, and they stand to gain Muslim confidence, which is everything. It is certainly, as Mr. Sastri, citing some member of the Reforms Enquiry Committee, says, a case of 'Heads I win, tails you lose'.

But I fear Hindus are neither so generous nor so far-seeing and they will not follow Mahatma Gandhi's advice which Lala Lajpat Rai characterises as Hindu surrender, and which he has repeatedly asked them to reject. To-day the Mussulmans are no better, and we can only take things as they are. In that case, I ask Mussulmans to be content with their numerical proportion in the population. That is a clean cut, and that is why Congress Mussulmans in the last resort favour it.

If Mr. Sastri was not living in another planet he would have known that these views were nothing new, and his taunts are not calculated to make me change them. In my address as President of the Indian National Congress I had expressed no other except that then I was still for the maintenance of the Lucknow Pact for the time being for those who would go to Councils, which for my part I considered *haram* for a Muslim to do.

Obviously we cannot bind 55 per cent Mussulmans to a 40 per cent representation as the Permanent Settlement of Bengal, and if Bengal Mussulmans are to have more than 40 per cent of the Lucknow Pact, as a United Provinces man I am willing to revise our 30 per cent representation too, and go back to 15 per cent that God and Muslim toleration of Hinduism has given to us in the provinces that were the centre of our rule for so many centuries. And I say to Madras, Central Provinces and other Muslim minorities also that a 5 per cent or 7 per cent minority cannot be 'adequately and effectively' protected by a 10 per cent or 15 per cent representation.

More: I say to Muslim majorities that *they* need no protection, and if Hindu minorities in Bengal, Punjab and the Frontier do not ask for separate electorates, it is not for *them* to clamour for it. This too is nothing new. Like my friend Dr. Ansari who had led, I had opposed on these points both Mr. Jinnah and Sir Fazl-i-Husain in the Muslim League at Lahore in May 1924, just as I opposed Sir Ali Imam, Mr. Jinnah and Sir Abdur Rahim at Aligarh in December 1925. In Bombay a year earlier our opposition in the Subjects Committee had held them down and these points were not discussed.

But a Mussulman is a Mussulman to Hindu politicians of Mr. Sastri's type, and whether he opposes the narrow-minded men of his own community

or supports them, he is equally damned. In fact, I come in for more censure from such Hindus than the Abdur Rahims and the Jinnahs, the Shafis and the Ali Imams. But since that is for a reason that is far from uncomplimentary to myself, I do not complain. I do not seek to be popular with narrow-minded Mussulmans by doing injustice to Hindu, and I do not seek to be popular with narrow-minded Hindus by doing injustice to Mussulmans. They say, in the Kingdom of the Blind the One-Eyed is hung! As for the man, that has both eyes, he is also drawn and quartered. If Mr. Sastri chooses to make India the Kingdom of the Blind, I must be content to be hanged, drawn and quartered.

I would invite Mr. Sastri's attention to my Cocanada Presidential Address in which I had clearly advocated. I had then said that even in separate electorates our choice should be unfettered, and at Aligarh too I said the same, for I want a client's right to choose his own counsel if he must have a law-suit with his brother. But he must be free to choose a Hindu counsel or a Muslim counsel according as he is satisfied by the ability and integrity of the one or the other. I had also advocated at Cocanada 'the progressive creation of mixed electorates to replace separate electorates'. When the Morley-Minto reforms were being discussed, I had opposed, along with Sir Ali Imam, the proposal of Mr. Ameer Ali who did not wish to risk any seat by agreeing to the retention of some mixed electorates, and wanted safe, even if fewer, seats for the Mussulmans. And I have always felt that it was a mistake when at Lucknow they decided, mainly I understand at the request of Hindus, to get rid of mixed territorial electorates altogether. They used to serve the purpose of providing not only for the needs of the present, but also for the prospects of the future. Therefore at Cocanada in asking for the 'progressive creation of mixed electorates' I said that as 'intercommunal relations improved, the number of seats thrown open for contest in mixed electorates may be increased, and those allotted to separate electorates decreased, till all come to be contested in mixed territorial electorates. The same policy should be adopted in throwing administrative posts open from communal to general competition.'

Mr. Sastri has not only ignored all this in attacking me but also the terms of the amendment I sought to move which Sir Abdur Rahim with his recent bureaucratic training wrongly ruled out of order. Had he considered that amendment and on its failure my opposition to Sir Ali Imam, he would not have paired me with the latter.

But I must frankly tell Mr. Sastri that the principle of communal electorates is not a concession, as he thinks, to 'theoretical property'. It is a confession of our failure in winning the confidence of minorities and it is our *Karma* for the injustices perpetrated in the past. Wherever mistrust exists, you will have to allow communal electorates, and neither local self-government can be excepted nor education. But it rests entirely with the majority how long this mistrust and the consequent communal electorates

last. Let the Hindus first treat as fellowmen and brothers their own co-religionists whom the men of so-called higher castes despise and ill-treat as untouchables and unapproachables. Let them remove the root evil of caste which is the negation of nationality. Let them show that the backwardness of Mussulmans is their own backwardness, and must be removed by joint national effort if the *nation* and not merely the *Hindus* are to advance. Then I promise Mr. Sastri no Mussulman will dream of asking for separate electorates.

Mr. Sastri and other Hindus, who profess to think that separate representation, if once permitted, will never disappear, must know that it is the child of the minorities' mistrust, and will go the day the Hindu majority proves not by its words, with which it is ever free, but by its acts, that it is not only Hindu, but Indian also. Let Mr. Sastri tell us what the Hindus have done as Indians to lift up Indian Mussulmans who have been educationally, and therefore economically also, backward, compared to what Mussulmans have done for them, and also compared to Hindus have done for Hindus, and then it will be time to tell the Mussulmans that Hindus are nationalists and the Mussulmans alone are communalists. The fact is Hindus, too, are in the worst sense Hindus first and everything else afterwards, and, in fact, they are castemen first, and even Hindus afterwards. And Mr. Sastri's own society of 'highbrows' too is almost just as Hindu as other Hindus, whether it puts on a communal label or not. If I were a Hindu and called myself a 'Servant of India' like Mr. Sastri, the first thing I would do as an Indian and as a 'servant of India' would be to serve every backward community and every minority in order to win its confidence and raise it to the higher level of other communities. *The speed of the fleet is the speed of its slowest boat.* That as yet, it should have been the easiest thing for a Hindu mind. The fact is his politics is of the 'Manchester School' with its Free Competition, in which every one is for himself and the Devil is to take hindmost. It is not of the Hindu Joint Family System in which the strong works and earns for the weak as well as for himself, and, in fact, more for weak as well as for the weaker brother than for himself. When Hindus adopt towards other communities their own Joint Family System all will be well.

At present even Hindus, the non-Brahmins of his own province, ask for and have separate representation. Let him not blame the Mussulmans. Like causes produce like consequences, and separate representation for Mussulmans as for Non-Brahmins in his Brahmin-ridden South is the *karma* of the injustice done to Mussulmans and to Non-Brahmins. I challenge any Hindu to deny this. But I know that a community which can defend the caste and tolerates untouchability is a freak community in the world, and instead of taking up such challenges to its sense of justice and reforming itself, it will continue to brag of its own nationalism and to blame others for their narrowness and separatism. It is not the first time that I have had

to say all this, but although attacks on Mussulmans and myself come as thick as leaves in Vallambrosa, my own attacks on the narrowness of a caste-ridden community are conveniently ignored. If Mr. Sastri is cast in a different mould, let *him* take up this challenge, or at least for the future not accuse the Mussulmans of separatism. We have among Mussulmans only too many selfish men and greedy men and men that love power for themselves. We have to fight such men and save the Mussulmans from falling into their hands. But when apparently responsible men like Mr. Sastri follow the lynch-law of the Hindu mob and make no discrimination even in favour of those that would stop at no sacrifice in the cause of national advancement except that of truth and religion, then indeed it does sometimes seem hopeless to convert this land of selfishness, bigotry and strife into a united nation struggling to be free.

Source : The Comrade, January, 1926.

16

SPECIAL SESSION OF THE ALL INDIA KHILAFAT CONFERENCE, DELHI

8 & 9 May 1926

The special session of the Khilafat Conference opened at Delhi on the 8 May in the morning in a pandal specially erected on the Maidan near the Delhi Fort. About three hundred delegates representing practically all the provinces, and over a thousand visitors attended on this day. Distinguished among those present were the Ali Brothers, Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Haji Hasan Nizami and Maulana Suleman. The proceedings commenced with recitations from the Quran.

WELCOME ADDRESS

Hakim Ajmal Khan, Chairman of the Reception Committee, then rose to welcome the delegates and in the course of his address declared that the Khilafat conference was not an organisation like the Hindu Mahasabha. It had never adopted a communal programme, though the Hakim Sahib admitted that some of the Khilafat workers had taken part in communalism. He regretted that the present state of Hindu-Muslim dissensions had overshadowed the national idea of freedom which was the birth right of every Indian.

Continuing, Hakim Ajmal Khan asserted that the affairs in Malabar and Kohat had excited the Hindus, infused a new life in Hindu communal activities and made the Mahasabha adopt measures like Sangathan and Shuddhi.

He asked whether such happenings did not occur at Arrah and Katarpur a few years ago, where a very large number of Mahommedans were the victims, but the Moslems took no action over it. He deplored that while they had no communal organisations, Hindu organisations were jeopardising the very existence of Islam. Concluding, the Chairman of the Reception Committee appealed to all Hindus to reconsider their programme and not to push the Moslems into the ditch of communalism.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Maulana Syed Suleman Nadvi (leader of the Khilafat delegation to the Hedjaz Muslim Conference) was then formally elected president amidst loud cheers of 'Allah O Akbar.' He delivered his presidential address extempore in Urdu for about two hours.

He traced the history and aims and objects of the Khilafat movement from its inception to the present date and referred specially to its pronational activities. He said it had worked for Islam abroad and it must protect their religion when it was in danger owing to the highhandedness of their neighbouring communities in India. Prominent Hindu leaders had openly incited the Hindus against the Moslems and yet advocated national unity at the Congress platform. But if the Hindus, he said, really wanted Swaraj, peace and brotherly goodwill to prevail in India they should abandon their present mentality.

The Muslims in India did not mind Sangathan but they were strongly concerned about Shuddhi. The Shuddhi movement was started in recent years at the instigation of a third party with financial help from even Hindu Native States like Kashmir and Baroda. The Sangathan, said the Maulana, had not been instituted for accelerating the attainment of Swaraj but for the dragging back the Moslems who were progressing forward for the attainment of Swaraj. The Khilafat workers, who were staunch supporters of Swaraj, did not deviate from their course even when their co-religionists accused them of anti-Muslim activities.

Proceeding the speaker said that the question now was how long could they allow the Muslims to be victimised by the Government on the one side and the Hindus on the other. The Mahommedans had in the past forfeited their riches, their lands and even their Empires but they had stood firm by their religion and would not tolerate interference with their religious rights and love for Islam. Inspite of all these hardships on them they felt it was not a courageous step to have a strong enemy and lay hands on unarmed Hindus. The times, however, had come when they should extend their hand to the Hindus who might accept it in friendship or as opposers in a wrestling field.

He reminded the audience that after the breakdown of the Muslim Empire the Hindus of Maharashtra and Bengal replaced their swords with pens and were poisoning the minds of the Hindus by writing anti-Muslim literature

and dramas. He challenged the Hindus to prove if any Mahommedan writer had done so.

Concluding the speaker said the Muslims must not depend upon the help of either Englishmen or Hindus, but must live by their own strength and appealed for unity amongst all sections of Mussulmans.

CALL FOR VOLUNTEERS

Mr. Abdur Rahman Dojanwe, who had to leave for Haj on that day, was allowed to address the Conference. He said that they had gathered together to deliver funeral orations on Hindu-Muslim unity. He deplored that slavery was ingrained in Hindu blood and they (Hindus) could not tolerate to see the Muslims free.

Sangathan and Suddhi were movements to divert the Muslim mind from Swaraj and enchain them for years to come. By their slavery of the last twelve hundred years, the Hindu mentality had been altogether changed. To them Swaraj did not mean freedom as was evident from their recent activity.

The Maulvi, proceeding, said that whatever religion was against freedom, should be crushed and annihilated. For this they had to send out many fighters. Every Muslim should be exhorted to bear in mind that he had no respect or companion for a 'Kafir', and even to extend the hand of friendship towards the Hindus would be construed as a sign of weakness on the part of Mussulmans. They should tell the Hindus to do what they please while they themselves should do what was necessary. They should, for instance, organize 10,000 volunteers under the leadership of Maulana Mahommed Ali in Delhi to safeguard Muslim interests against the repetition of Calcutta riots. If the Muslims in India come out in the field with an effective force, the Lalas would come forward with folded hands and make peace in two hours.

The Conference dispersed at 12 o'clock and reassembled at 9 p.m. in the evening. Attendance improved considerably, the Pandal being fully packed. The proceedings were very lively and deliberations continued till the small hours of the morning.

Two resolutions were passed, one regarding change in the constitution of the Khilafat Committee enabling it to undertake work for the amelioration of conditions of Moslems in India, Tanzim, Tabligh, education etc., and the other dealing with steps to be taken to help Muslims before and after disturbances, before in form of efforts for peace, after in helping accused on trial etc., widows and orphans.

Maulana Sirajuddin of Rewari made a short speech denouncing the new move. With what force, he asked, could they, who had all along been condemning the Hindu Sabhas, now adopt its methods ? No good would come out of it. Only those who had so far kept out of the Hindu Sabha would join it, and further strengthen 'Sangathan', while the Ali Brothers would be enjoying Haj.

Maulana Mahommed Ali in supporting Tabligh said it was the duty of

every Muslim to convert non-Muslims to Islam. He prayed for the day when he would convert Gandhi to Islam.

KHILAFAT COMMITTEE'S CREED

Maulana Mahommed Ali moved the first resolution which runs as follows :

This conference resolves that the following shall be the creed of the Central Khilafat Committee.

(a) There shall be formed one great Khilafat Central organisation.

(b) It shall make all efforts for the freedom of Zazirat-ul-Arab and for the betterment of the Hedjaz and holy cities and the introduction of reforms in those places according to circumstances.

(c) It shall struggle for the attainment of Swaraj in India.

(d) It shall always strive to safeguard the religious, educational, social, economic and political interests of Indian Mussulmans and to reform and organise them.

Maulana Mahommed Ali, in moving the resolution, referred to certain Hindu celebrities who were creating new Indian histories which reflected adversely on the past Muslim rulers. The allegations contained in these histories, he said, stood self-condemned as the Muslim empires existed for over six hundred years. The Muslims were the advocates of Indian Swaraj, and not of the Afghan rule in India as was alleged by the Hindus. He deplored the disorganised state of the Muslims and appealed for men and money with a right to kick out those workers who misappropriated their funds.

Maulana Hussain Ahmed Khan alluded to the Hindu activities for creating an alliance with foreign communities like the Buddhists, inviting the Maharaja of Nepal to preside over the Hindu Mahasabha and such other deeds the like of which was not attempted by the Muslims.

Mohammed Saddique of Kadian also supported the resolution which on being put to the vote was carried, one delegate dissenting.

COMMUNAL DISSENSIONS

Maulana Zafarul Mullick proposed the following resolution :

The special session of the Khilafat conference, having regard to and after considering the existing state of affairs that has been created by dissensions and disturbances and by the increasing frictions between Hindus and Mussulmans and having regard to the fact that not much action has so far been taken that could put a stop to these disturbances or check them effectively and bring the prevailing state of affairs under complete control, considers that wherever it might be necessary to safeguard the interests, life and property of Indian Muslims, all action should be taken that may be found necessary to meet local conditions. The conference, therefore, directs all Khilafat committees as follows : Wherever there may be a possibility of tension between Hindus and Muslims or whenever a disturbance has actually taken place owing to

communal feelings, the Khilafat Committee should do all to get the matter settled amicably, compose the differences, remove the tens' n and achieve an honourable compromise between the parties through prominent Hindu and Muslim leaders of the provinces.

If the efforts at compromise fail, the Khilafat Committee should do all to protect the political, social, economic and religious rights of the Muslims and render every moral and material support to the Moslems whose rights, interests, lives and property might have been endangered or suffered owing to communal dissensions or disturbances.

Everywhere before any disturbance has occurred, for the purpose of self-defence and in order to protect the Muslims and maintain peace, volunteers of the Khilafat corps should, under responsible workers and having full regard to the principles of the Khilafat Committee, be present at the places of the disturbance to render all possible help and service.

Whenever innocent Mahommedans have to be protected from the grip of the law court and tyranny of police, the local Khilafat Committee should, keeping in view their creed of non-co-operation take all necessary and urgent defensive action.

Every Khilafat Committee, which has to remove communal dissensions or protect the Muslims during or after the disturbances, should be authorised to raise special funds and spend the necessary amounts from their general fund. The committee may also require and get further aid, if necessary, from the Provincial and Central Khilafat Committee.

All Provincial committees shall have to see that their subordinate committees act with full vigour upon the directions of this Conference, and whenever men, money or advice was needed the Provincial committees should render every possible help.

In the course of his speech Maulana Mullick pointed out that the resolution was essentially a defensive measure in case communal disturbances occurred. He, however, still hoped that unity could be effected with their Hindu brethern.

UPROARIOUS SCENES

At this stage a number of voices shouted against the speaker's using the word 'Brethern' for the Hindus. Uproarious scenes followed, a number of delegates standing up and demanding the withdrawal of the objectionable word. Some of them suggested that the Quran should be consulted on the subject. Calm was, however, restored, but not until fervent appeals for tolerance by the President and Maulana Shaukat Ali were made.

Concluding the speaker emphasised that the resolution aimed at peaceful negotiations on honourable terms with the Hindus, but if their feelings were not reciprocated by the Hindus they knew their duty to Islam.

Maulana Mazharuddin and Khwaja Hassan Nizami and some others supported the resolution while Mr. Sirajuddin opposed it. The resolution

being put to vote was carried, only four voting against it. The Conference then adjourned.

SANGATHAN MOVEMENT CONDEMNED

Four resolutions were passed at the resumed session of the Conference in the next morning. After recitations of poems, specially composed for the occasion exhorting Muslims to organise and sacrifice themselves for their religion, Mr. Mahommed Shafi proposed a resolution condemning responsible members of the Hindu Mahasabha for their Sangathan activities, which he characterised as a wrong and short-sighted policy, prejudical to the prosperity and liberation of the country, and exhorting the Muslims to keep their feelings carefully under control and spend all their energies on the constructive programme of purifications, improvement and strengthening of their community. The course of events in the country, said Mr. Shafi, were gradually leading them to a crisis. The situation, he emphasised, was serious and required a speedy settlement. As before, the two communities were to live in India, indefinitely. They could not afford to be always up in arms against each other. These inter-communal tumults were not only extremely injurious to the participants themselves but also stood in the way of attainment of self-government.

Maulana Shaukat Ali, supporting the resolution, eulogised the Khilafatists for furthering the national cause. England, said the Maulana, had misled the Hindus from national activities to inter-communal strife and aggression. He advised the Mussulmans not to commit the same blunder. Both the communities should try to live in a state of friendship towards each other. If the Hindus or any other community attacked the Muslims, he would always advise them to pay back in the like manner.

Mr. Sirajuddin opposed the resolution, as he was against the Khilafat organisation undertaking such programme which he said, should be left to other bodies. The resolution was eventually carried by an overwhelming majority.

ECONOMY IN EXPENDITURE

Maulana Mohammad Irfan next moved a resolution requesting Muslims to give up all unnecessary expenditure at times of festivities and funerals. He pointed out how the Muslims in India were handicapped, chief of them being their poverty and lack of organisation. This resolution too, was carried unanimously.

OTHER RESOLUTIONS

Maulana Abubakar moved the third resolution exhorting Muslims to perform regular prayers in congregations five times a day. Khawaja Hassan Nizami vehemently supported the resolution, which was carried.

The last resolution appealed to the Muslims to keep intact their religious

interests, to bring about necessary reforms among themselves and to extend mutual toleration and avoid calling others 'Kafirs' on trifling differences.

The meeting then adjourned to meet again in the evening when the conference concluded after the adoption of resolutions sympathising with the Mussulman victims in the Panipat riots, condemning the anti-Moslem literature, defening the Khilafat policy towards the attainment of Swaraj and appointing a committee to formulate the rights and claims of the Moslems and put them forward before the country.

Source : The Annual Quarterly Register, January-June 1926, Vol. I.

17

THE BENGAL MUSLIM PARTY
SIR ABDUR RAHIM'S MANIFESTOES

'I am being repeatedly asked by many friends in Calcutta and the mofussil to issue an appeal to the Mahommedan Constituencies in view of the forthcoming elections. I have from time to time expressed my views in no ambiguous terms on the general political situation and the attitude which the Mussulmans should adopt and I am glad to find that the suggestion which I made in my speech at Aligarh that the Muslim members be returned by the Mahommedan Constituencies in the Legislative Council and the Assembly should form themselves into a party, has now been accepted with practical unanimity all over India. Even the Swarajists, who are still trying their best to entrap some Mahommedans to buttress their tottering organisation, are unwilling or unable to adopt a policy of toleration and genuine nationalism which would accept recognition as much of the rights and interests of the Mussulmans as of other communities. The Congress is equally dominated by militant communal Hindu politicians and the political attitude of the Responsivists whose high priests are Pt. Madan Mohan Malaviya, Dr. Moonje and in Bengal Mr. B. Chakravarty towards Muslim interests hardly requires elucidation.

I understand from what is appearing in certain newspapers and from what has been reported to me that the Congress, the Swarajists and Responsivists are all united in one thing and that is to keep me and the party, I represent out of the Council or to divide the Muslim members in the Council into conflicting groups. In fact, no secret is made of this, but what naturally is not disclosed by our political opponents is the method they are adopting to secure their object. They are relying on the services of two classes of men : (1) some Mussulmans who are so greatly indebted to the Congress or the

Swaraj Party or to some of their important leaders that they find themselves obliged to work for them either openly or secretly, quite irrespective of any other consideration (2) those Mussulmans who have personal ambitions of their own and are trying to form a group at any cost so that they may be in a position to bargain with any party that may emerge into power, whether that party be that of Pt. Malaviya and Mr. Byomkesh Chakravarty or of Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta. All these gentlemen for purposes of election may even feel no hesitation in publicly professing dissatisfaction with the Swarajists or the Responsivists and vehemently asserting their independence and courage but always keeping their eye on the main chance. I wish to aware my community against the activities of both these classes of men.

I am further aware that there are individuals, who, for one reason or another, are actuated by unfriendly feelings towards me personally. Nor is it possible for me to minimise that fact that those feelings are being sedulously exploited by the unscrupulous propaganda of some Hindu politicians who have been straining every nerve to oust me from the political arena on the alleged ground that my principles of action are 'communal' and anti-national. I need hardly observe that the allegation is wholly false and unfounded and is refuted by every record of my public life unless my political opponents base their allegation on the mere fact that I have been trying to impress upon my community the need for safeguarding its own political, religious and civic rights and interests by means of constitutional measure, while making its best contribution towards advancing India's cause. This, indeed, I regard it to be my obvious duty to inculcate, not only because self-defence is the first law of nature but because I believe that India can have no political future, without the hearty co-operation of the Muslims.

It is well known that I am the President of the Bengal Muslim Party which was formed on the second day of the First Session of the Council held this year, and the political principles of the party are fully explained in the manifesto which has already been published in the newspapers and distributed in the various centres of Muslim population. All the non-Swarajist Muslim members with the exception of one or two free lancers have hitherto acted together in that party and I recommend to the Mahommedan Constituencies those candidates, who are willing to act as bona fide and loyal members of a United Muslim party based on those principles.

I am willing to offer my services once again for the Council but if my services are to be of any use there, I shall expect the Mahommedan Constituencies not merely to return me but also men with whom as colleagues it will be possible for me to work in unison and harmony in these difficult and critical times.

II

Subsequently Sir Abdur Rahim issued another manifesto on the 18th

September in the course of which he said :

'I hold clear and definite views which I have never hesitated to express about the unwisdom of pursuing a policy of blind obstruction in Legislative Council, nor have I seen eye to eye with the Swarajists in many of their tactics. I do, however, strongly protest against the method that is being adopted in certain quarters in order to secure a body of legislators willing to make the best use of the present constitution, doubtless a laudable object. The Swarajists will take care of themselves and all that I wish to do is to dispel certain false and mischievous impressions that are being created with regard to my attitude and that of the Bengal Muslim Party which I represent. I am undoubtedly trying my best to bring all the Muslim members of the Council on the same platform, but I wish emphatically to repudiate the suggestion that is being made from day to day in some form or other that my object in doing so is, by capturing the Government, to secure the spoils and to injure the interests of the Hindus. I venture to think that the proper way of persuading the representatives of the people to make the best use of the present constitution, defective as it is, is not to excite communal passions of the Hindus or of the Muslims by telling each group in turn that, unless you consolidate your forces, your interests will be in jeopardy at the hands of the representatives of the other community, but to tell both of them that if you act together you can do a fair amount of good work for the benefit of the people, such as, by instituting free and compulsory education among the masses, by improving their health conditions, by ameliorating the lot of the ryots and the labourer and by organising the right sort of secondary, technical and higher education along the lines which will help the economic development of the country as well as the interests of science and culture. That is the objective which the Bengal Muslim Party has placed before the country.

We, of the Bengal Muslim Party, have, it is true, adopted a communal designation for our political organisation, but all political organisations in this country have in fact been of a communal character. I fail to understand why the representatives of each community, while fully undertaking to see that its special rights and interests are safeguarded, should not be able to combine and work together for the common cause of the country. That is the ideal which we have set before ourselves and that, I venture to think, is the only practicable ideal so long as there remain differentiated communities in India. We definitely set our face against the domination of the class or community by another. If it be possible after the next elections to work the transferred departments through Ministers, I, for one, would insist on the co-operation of Muslim members on equal terms, inevitably excluding only the section which refused to utilise the present constitution. I must say, however, that if a sufficient number of Indian members of the Legislative Council apply themselves earnestly to constructive work, very good results may be achieved even without Ministers. In proof of this, I point to the Legislative Assembly which has to its credit very important achievements though there had been no

Ministers there. Some might say because there had been no Ministers. No one will deny that the Ministers have to face very great difficulties which I pointed out in some detail before the Muddiman Committee and the prospect of being called upon to fill one of these offices cannot evoke much enthusiasm in the breast of any well-informed politician. Certainly, it would not in mine.

Source: The Indian Quarterly Register, July-December 1926, Vol. II.

18

SHEIKH ABDULLAH ON INDEPENDENT MUSLIM PARTY

The question of starting Muslim political party was under contemplation for the last eight or nine months. Muslim politicians have hitherto had no status or position as members of any sane but stable Muslim party. They generally used to attach themselves, according to their own inclination, to any of the diverse parties which derived their origin from the Indian National Congress. Some of them were led by the Swarajists while there were others who either went over to the fold of Liberals or Loyalists. Now when a great communalist party among the Hindus has risen to the top and had brushed aside all opposition before it at a sweep, the Mussulmans are naturally beginning to feel anxious as to their own future political career. They could not possibly join hands with the Hindu communalists nor there was any other sane and at the same time stable political party which might have attracted them to co-operate with it. Under this state of affairs, there could be no alternative but the formation of a separate independent party. Now the Independent Muslim party has come into existence, and from the temperament of Mussulmans it can fairly be hoped that they will be ready to lend the party their whole-hearted support so that in the political life of the country the party may be in a position to play a great part.

The following points require a special mention in connection with the new party :

1. The Moslem party must not be suspected to be a party of narrow-minded communalists but on the other hand it will be a party with the broadest possible political principles and far-reaching political programme.

2. It will be prepared to co-operate not only with any other political party the aim of which may be the common good of the country but, on occasions, it will be ready to lend its support to the government and to throw its weight against any of the parties whose object will be to defeat the higher national aims through its narrow-minded communalism.

3. The Moslem Independent Political party has set before it as its goal the attainment of self-government in India by constitutional means but it will not tolerate the introduction of any such measure that may not be in consonance with the special interest of the Moslem community.

These few principles I have placed before my community and country so as to clear any mis-apprehension that might have arisen about the aim and objects of a newly born Muslim Party.

Source ; The Aligarh Mail, October 1926.

19

MOHAMMED ALI ON COMMUNAL STRIFE

'Neither community can maintain this silly warfare for long and allow its members to be beaten and battered, crushed and killed, just for the fun of beating a tom-tom before a mosque or the fun of stopping it, in order to prove communal strength', declared Mr. Mohammed Ali in an interview today. 'These are only signs of communal silliness, but such stupidity in the masses is not likely to disappear until political leaders of the two communities cease to use the masses as tools in the vile cause of their own self-aggrandisement.'

Mr. Mohammed Ali added that the question would never have arisen if the two communities were not in a frightfully bad temper. It was particularly foolish Mahommedans to make a counter to Hindu agitation for stopping of cow-killing. It was much easier to stop music before mosques, and it costs nothing, while it was very difficult to prevent poor and needy meat-eating Mahommedans from buying beef, which was much cheaper than mutton. If beef was to be entirely excluded from the menu of the Mahommedans, the meat bill of the community was bound to rise very considerably.

COW KILLING

From time to time there had been a recrudescence of the anti-cow-killing agitation and, curiously enough, while everyday the slaughter of cows was apparently tolerated, far greater fuss was made over the few additional cows killed for religious sacrificial purposes.

He had all along desired that Mussulmans should, as far as possible, avoid cow-killing out of deference to Hindu sentiments, however unreasonable it might appear to them. He did not wish them to sell their right. To sell it at the price of the stoppage of music before mosques was to make a very bad

bargain.

Thousands of Hindu and Mahommedan processions, religious and domestic, used to pass before mosques in many places without let or hindrance. because it did not then occur to any Hindu to stop such a procession, particularly before a mosque, and make as much hideous noise as possible there, just when congregational prayers were going on. But now such things did take place, and the question of music before mosques had been taken up by impatient people on both sides as the one issue on which the strength of the two communities was to be tried. Neither Hindu nor Muslim was apparently willing to surrender to the other. But they surrender to good sense and recognize the claims of good fellowship.

POLITICAL AGITATORS

But, alas, the little breed of political agitators had succeeded far beyond what he had expected in 1923, but he thought their success would itself work out their ruin. People would refuse to spend thousands of rupees in fighting communal cases in court or going to prison, or being hanged just for the fun of seeing their leaders returned by thumping majorities to Councils and Assembly and welcoming them on their tours throughout the country with loud cheers and garlands.

At present the masses were suffering from a sort of remittent fever. Nothing would bring down the temperature, but when the fever had run its course the patient would be left a bag of bones, with a very low temperature, to regain his health by slow degrees.

'Let us hope that relief will come before the patient is so exhausted that he will only find rest and peace in the grave'.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, September 1926.

20

THE COMMUNAL TENSION

I

The debate in the Legislative Assembly on the communal situation was quite remarkable although it did not lay down or suggest any practical solution for the rapprochement of the breach that has become such a familiar feature of our national life. The members of the Assembly were profuse in their protestations of disgust with the present state of affairs. Some members, who undoubtedly have contributed more than their ample share in creating

the present unpleasantness were, perhaps, loudest in their denunciation of the present situation.

One only wishes that they were sincere in their desire to bring about Hindu-Muslim Unity, but that unfortunately must remain a pious wish, at least for some time to come.

The very discussion that was intended to clear the atomosphere and lay down some practical measure for preventing communal riots contained enough to show the direction in which wind was blowing. By insinuations and in-uendoes some members, like our redoubtable Lala Lajpat Rai and the revered Pandit from Allahabad tried to fasten the blame on the community that unfortunately happen to be the bugbear of their innocent lives. Others tried to find out the causes that have led to this deplorable condition ar they discussed everything under the sun except those that had any real bear...g on the case. One is really perplexed to understand whether these gentlemen were really so obtuse as not to see the real nature of the trouble or they merely pretended to find out the causes without any intention of ever doing so.

The causes for this disunity are quite such a mystery that they can defy detection by such cleverlaw yers like Lalaji or Panditji. As pointed out by more than one non-Hindu member, these riots were not religious. Cow sacrifice and music before mosque merely furnish occasions to give vent to those long suppressed feelings of antagonism that are result of causes far more potent than those generally assigned to them. These disturbances are mainly economic and to a lesser degree political in nature, and religion is simply dragged in to clothe and disguise its real character.

Whenever in the history of a nation a section of it usurps the rights and privileges of another and a weaker section, discord and dessension, riots and other manifestations or ill feeling are bound to make their appearance. It often happens that the weaker section passively submits, for a time, to the domination of the stronger section but there comes always a stage at which the weaker community reaches the limit of their endurance and then ensues the period of struggle.

But it is not the only way in which the 'era of clash' may come . Sometimes it happens that for some reasons or other the weaker and the oppressed community suddenly becomes self-conscious and wants to occupy its proper place in the society. Then its passivity changes into activity, which naturally frightens the privileged class. In their fright, as well as lust for power and greed for wealth the privileged class tries to curb the activity of their weaker brethren and failing in that endeavours its level best to put obstructions in the way of their opponents. Under these circumstances, a clash becomes inevitable.

The same thing has happened in India; Hindus because of their numbers and their aptitude to adopt themselves to the changing conditions of time have to a very large extent been enjoying certain privileges to the exclusion of other communities. Economic pressure and the great upsetting of social stan-

dards and conventions that followed the termination of the great war brought self-consciousness to the various classes and communities in India and they began to assert their rights and demands, in a peremptory manner, what was legitimately due to them. This irked the privileged classes and thus dawned the era of clash. Today one finds Indians ranged against an alien beauracracy and Government, Mahommedans facing Hindus, non Brahmins arrayed against Brahmins.

To illustrate the point more fully take the case of the Punjab, Bengal and Madras. In the Punjab, Muslims form the majority. For a long time the Muslims so to speak were not conscious and as a result, though they were dominated by the minority in all walks of life, economic, political and social, they remained passive. On becoming self-conscious, for reasons enumerated above and because of many other contributing causes, they demanded what was due to them, and this aroused a keen antagonism amongst the privileged Hindu Class. The very identical thing happened in Bengal and Madras where too Muslims and the depressed classes respectively formed the majority but were dominated by the minority which consisted of wealthy and more educated Hindus of the upper caste. To-day the major classes in these provinces are trying to assert their privileges and finding their just demands denied to them, they in their irritation become sulky in their mood. The other side being in even a worse humour goes out of its way to afford them causes to quarrel, the result is a long continuation of riots and disturbances of peace.

Here is the genesis of communal question, which is more or less, obvious to every thinking man, who sincerely tries to study the question from an impartial point of view. The remedy for removing this evil is very obvious though not quite as easy to practice.

II

It was shown in our last issue that the communal trouble in India was not religious in nature, though to catch the imagination of the masses politicians tried to parade it before public eye in the guise of religion. During the debate in the Legislative Assembly on this question, Lala Lajpat Rai, among many others agreed, though only in an indirect way, that the causes for the present high state of tension were far more political than religious. They thought the present ill feeling between the Hindus and the Mussulmans was mainly due to the system of Communal Representation, as it tended to sharpen and develop the lines of cleavage between the two great communities of the land.

The assertion is childish and merely demonstrates the futility of expecting clear and logical and, at the sametime, sincere and patriotic thinking on the part of this brand of politicians. If one were inclined to be less charitable, he would say that insistence with which they are carrying on the propaganda against separate representation showed something more than a mere absence

of the capacity to conduct a reasoning to its logical conclusion. It showed the pettiness of their mind as well as their insincerity. While they were talking with such vehemence against communal antagonism and pleading for more sympathetic understanding of each others ideals and ambitions, there was present, lurking in the background of their minds, that very feeling which they were denouncing, and in a much keener form than that which is usually entertained by a man in the street except when he is in a frenzy of fanatical excitement. It is perhaps this feeling of antagonism not often expressed in words which is so frequently responsible for the hopeless jumbling of the reasoning processes of this group and for the beclouding of intellect with which most of these gentlemen are keenly endowed.

Communal representation, it is evident, is not a desideratum in itself. It is merely a safeguard against certain unwelcome and unfortunate conditions that might creep into our national life if this safeguard is to be thrown overboard. In fact, separate representation was not introduced into the body politique of this country until its necessity was clearly and keenly felt in order to make safe the future of democracy in India. The system is going to, or at least it should, last until the factors that necessitated its introduction do not disappear. Any premature experiment to do away with it is bound to prove disastrous not only to the Muslims but to India in general and to the cause of democracy in India in particular. When the proper time arrives it will die of itself. It would be best for them who do not wish the system to live long in this country, to divert their attention and use their energies in removing those causes that have brought it into life.

Mixed Electorate does not necessarily mean a united nation. Quite often, one may say almost always, when proper understanding between the component parts of a nation is lacking, mixed electorate becomes a weapon of tyranny and injustice in the hands of stronger section of the nation to oppress the weaker ones. In America, which enjoys a mixed electorate and has a general suffrage, the negroes are being oppressed because they, being weak, are pushed aside and have no voice in the government. It was only the other day that Governor Alfred Smith, a whiteman, was refused nomination for presidentship on the democratic ticket simply because he was a Catholic; incidentally it may be mentioned that no Catholic has ever been elected president of the United States. The condition was not much different in India before separate representation was introduced. Before the system was introduced into local bodies, the representation of Muslims was hardly ever adequate for them.

There are also instances when the stronger community tries to disenfranchise the weaker ones as is the case in South Africa and many other countries. South Africa is supposed to have a democratic government, but it is not to be supposed that any sane man would suggest that we want the same atrocities perpetrated in India. Sectionalism is never good for any country as it is always bound to prove a constant source of strife, but it is even worse when it occurs in a so-called democratic form of government.

India can only avoid the danger by retaining separate representation until it has levelled up the backward communities. If India does not want to retain it, is there any other scheme besides it which can effectively check this evil? If there is none, then why try to do away with the only plan which can prevent injustice and tyranny from cropping up into our national life.

But self-interest and morbid communalism of a certain section of Hindu politicians refuses to look at this aspect of the question. They simply demand that separate representation must be done away with, no matter what comes afterwards. They want for themselves and their community not only what they already possess but what they consider lost to them because of the advance made by other communities under the protecting wing of the system of separate representation.

It is not rather strange that these gentlemen who so violently denounce alien bureaucracy that has usurped the right of the native population of India and who condemn it because it refuses to abdicate in favour of a native government are themselves such stout champions of sectional domination? For abolition of communal representation possesses no significance other than that which has been indicated above.

The solution of India's trouble lies not in the abolition of separate electorate but in something else which would be dealt with in these columns later; but let us, to day, appeal to the good sense and patriotism of our Hindu brethren not to widen the breach which is already entirely too wide, by insisting on the abolition of separate electorates. If they have the good of the country at the heart, let them try to conciliate the opinion of the weaker and smaller communities as soon as suspicions are removed, understanding established and confidence restored, and Muslims brought into the line with the Hindu community they would, of their own accord, give up the privilege of communal representation. Similarly Muslims should do their level best to do their share of the work by meeting the Hindus more than half way.

III

Of other remedies, besides the abolition of communal representation, a ban on cow sacrifice is suggested with more frequency and greater insistence. In fact this Cow question has been given so much prominence and propaganda in this connection has been engineered with such consumate skill that it has even penetrated into a considerable number of homes other than those the politicians. It is quite often suggested, even in otherwise intelligent quarters, that for the sake of unity Muslims should give up cow sacrifice. The suggestion, on face of it, looks very tempting for those who would not consent to abstain from cow-sacrifice for the sake of peace and national solidarity. But will it bring peace? The answer is No.

Prevention of cow-sacrifice does not mean cow protection. The sacrifice is only made once in a year and perhaps a few thousand animals are

killed on a particular day, while thousands upon thousands of these animals are slaughtered every day. If protection of the cow is the central idea then this daily slaughter should have been just as distasteful to the Hindus as the sacrifice on the Bakar-Id day. This, apparently is not the case because cow-killing on normal days of the year does not provide stimulus strong enough to cause disturbance of public peace and tranquility, while on the sacrifice day it does. Similarly there is absolutely no reason why Hindu religious feeling should be so deeply disturbed as to cause breach of peace by killing the animal on any particular day while it is hardly affected by the knowledge that same act being performed every day only under other name. It is, therefore, clear that the agitation is neither religious nor economic, but political as it furnishes a rallying cry to bring around the various sections and sub-sections of the Hindu society as opposed to other communities living in this country. If we give up not only cow sacrifice but also killing of the animal altogether, the communal leaders of the Hindus would not rest in their beds until another and more effective war cry is discovered.

Looking at the question from an economic point of view one would find theory of cow protection quite unsound and to the disadvantage of India, in general. It is urged that in order to have dairy food of good quality more plentifully, protection should be granted to cows.

But it is wrong to suppose that a plentiful supply of dairy products is dependent upon protection being granted to cows. In Australia and America, where cows enjoy no such protection, the dairy produce is so plentiful that after their home consumption is satisfied, they send out thousands of tons of them to other countries. The supply of dairy produce depends more upon the breed of the cattle than upon mere numbers. In fact India possesses too many heads of cattle already. Most of them are under-fed and undeveloped wretched looking animals. Any large increase in their number will necessarily mean a curtailment of their food-ration which in its turn will cause further deterioration of the breed. Instead of protection, we need elimination of low breed cattle and general improvement of the stock.

Protection of cow will not only make serious inroads into fodder supply of India and tend to the general deterioration of the stock, but will hurt the Indian trade in another way too. India enjoys a considerable trade in hides, boots and shoes manufacture. Tannaries are making a great headway and trade in other leather goods is quite a thriving one in this country. By adopting a policy of protection, India will be voluntarily giving up this very profitable business. Thus a policy of protection will put a drain on our supply of economic goods on one side and stop the inflow of a considerable amount of wealth on the other. Can India afford to do it ? Certainly not. It is foolish enough to adopt this policy of protection. India will become poorer than what it is today. Poverty always breeds discontent and discontentment is bound to manifest itself in riots and other disturbances of public peace.

IV

In previous issues the remedies frequently suggested by prominent Mahasabhaites and other Hindu leaders have been discussed and a thorough examination of them conclusively established that abolition of separate electorate and a ban on cow-killing would not prove very effective in bringing about better relations between the two important communities. On the contrary they might work, if adopted, positive harm to the best interests of India.

The question of music before mosque, also has to be settled. It has been suggested by those who profess to seek a solution of the communal problems that local custom should be adhered to. The suggestion offers some practical difficulties which it is hard to surmount. No one can say that there has been a single instance in the past in which any community at any place has admitted that it was acting contrary to the established customs of the place. Usually the authorities who are called upon to make the ruling are perplexed with bewildering claims advanced by the quarrelling communities and sometimes blunder into orders that do not follow lines laid down by practices that have usually been adhered to in the past. Consequently greater ill-feeling is caused and relation between the communities becomes more strained.

The only just solution of these problems is furnished by a right conception of the idea of toleration towards practices and beliefs of other people who differ with us, without any regard being paid to the merits and demerits of these beliefs and practices. A Hindu should not bother himself whether a few more cows are sacrificed on Bakar Id day just as he does not usually bother himself about cows being slaughtered on other days of the year. Similarly a Muslim, should not insist that music should be stopped when passing a mosque, just as he does not ask the din and the noise of traffic to cease when time for prayer approaches. Of course care should be taken that nothing is done to wound wantonly feelings of or to cause irritation to any community. Muslims should not make a special show of cows that are to be sacrificed, nor Hindus should make it a point to stop before mosque to give an exhibition of the strength of their lungs by shouting 'Jai Jai' or the melodiousness of their musical instruments. The mutual regard thus shown would, of itself, minimize the importance of these questions which would in due course, dwindle into insignificance.

Some people may advance the objection that it is not easy to bring about, universally, this change of heart, this new orientation of the communal question. It may not be easy but it is not impossible either. If there is a real desire on the part of the leaders of the two communities this change can be affected in an extremely short period. Our masses have shown their capacity to follow the lead given to them by those whom they trust. During the days of non-cooperation, inspite of the influences that were brought to

bear upon them, they gave their enthusiastic support to the movement because it was led by Mahatma Gandhi, a man whom they trusted, and because his lieutenants had convinced them of their sincerity by welcoming great hardships and making untold sacrifices. Whether the movement was sound or otherwise, the masses whole heartedly supported the movement. There is no reason why the leaders should not receive just as good a response provided that they convince the people at large of the earnestness of their desire and the sincerity of their purpose.

It would not serve the purpose to talk about unity and learning the use of Lathi in one and the same breath. They must not talk about reconciliation and wholesale conversion within the same minute. These movements may not be bad in themselves but they are, to say the least, inopportune. It is neither the proper moment to insist upon rights and privileges as these discussions naturally excite the communal and fanatical zeal of the communities.

The politics of this country is going from bad to worse and unless vigorous measures are adopted to check the growing evil of communalism, it would eat up the very vitals of our national life. A strong organization with a zealous band of workers is needed to push forward the propaganda for toleration for therein lies the solution of most of our problems. No arrangement is going to work out until and unless to followers of every religion perfect liberty of worship and freedom to observe religious ceremonies and festivals are granted unhampered by irritating restrictions when they do not conduct their observances merely to cause annoyance to other people.

Other political problems, like that of the separate electorate and kindred questions should also be tackled from a broad national view-point. We should not insist upon the abolition of separate representation simply because the majority community wants its abolition so that it may dominate the other communities. As was pointed in a previous article it would be to the detriment of India to abolish the communal representation. The Hindu leaders, in order to inspire confidence among the Muslims, to guard against sectionalism and in the interest of India's advance should help the Muslim to maintain the system until the proper moment comes for its abolition, and it will not be long in coming if the suggestion is carried out.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, September 1926 (Editorials).

21

THE HINDU-MUSLIM PROBLEM
ANALYSIS BY IMTIAZ MOHAMMAD KHAN

Statesmen, politicians and journalists have in recent years written and spoken on this most thorny question of Indian politics. They have explored almost every region to find out the fundamental causes of difference and quarrel between the two communities and consequently it is not an easy task for a layman to add anything new to these researches. To some the struggle is really economic and each community is trying to oust the other from its position of vantage. To others it is due to the presence of rival religions and hence, they argue, it is the inevitable result of the revival of orthodoxy during the last five years due to the blunders of those who were masters of the Press and platform. Therefore, the argument goes. Those who have made the welfare of the country their first concern should start on clean slate, push religion back into the background and make three hundred million fundamentally religious people of India forget their past history and traditions. But is it, the layman asks, practical politics, though it may be an ideal solution ?

Then what is the fundamental cause and how to remove it? The following data selected from the happenings of the last five years supply clear premises from which we may draw some conclusions.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE EDUCATED CLASSES

(1) Hindu and Muslim educated classes have been fighting over the assignment of posts in the government services and representation in the council.

(2) Hindu educated classes complain of the Muslim extra-territorial patriotism which, they argue, will do more harm than good to India the love of which ought to occupy the foremost place in the heart of the Muslims.

(3) The Muslim educated classes complain of Hindus exclusive and narrow cult which has never made the Muslims feel that India is as much their motherland as it is of the Hindus. As the Hindus are, they argue, in overwhelming majority and much better equipped majority there is no chance for them to survive in the economic struggle.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE ILLITERATE MASSES

How riots are caused is a matter of common knowledge.

Muslims fight either when music is played before the mosque or when the Hindus do not allow their *Taziyas* to go out freely.

(2) Hindus fight when the Muslims sacrifice cows or disturb their processions.

Now a comparison of the attitudes brings out the facts—

(1) The upper classes fight for economic advantages, or in other words, for something material.

(2) The lower classes fight just for a sentiment.

Therefore it may be hazarded that the fundamental cause of difference will probably vanish if the upper classes are satisfied by some scheme which insures the economic freedom of one community against the attacks of the other. The masses will simply follow the lead of the upper classes, as they always do. Beside, the solid economic considerations will in the long run prevail over religious sentiments.

But it is a mistake to suppose that any kind of settlement, howsoever ideal it may be, will at once remove the tension existing at present, because (1) the rise or revival of Hindu nationalism, which from its very nature is always narrow and exclusive, is entirely a new 'limb' in the Indian body politics. Consequently the disturbances in the 'body' will continue till this new 'limb' finds a place to settle down. (2) Muslims being in a minority will not cast off their suspicions of the designs of the majority till they are really convinced that those whom they have to deal are really sincere. Consequently the envoys of peace who undertake the proposed settlement between the two communities need not be disheartened if they see no sign of the abatement of these quarrels in the near future.

Under the present conditions the lead for a settlement must come from the Hindus because they are not only in majority but they have also developed more political 'instinct' than the Muslims have. Besides this, a majority can afford to make more sacrifices than a minority, because the accruing benefit from a really workable settlement will naturally go more to those who are greater in number than to those who are in a minority.

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

The general principles governing the terms must be the following—

(1) Those provinces in which particular community is dominant must remain under the domination of that community, while the minority in that province will retain its due rights but it will never be made into a majority for the purpose of representation.

(2) Those provinces in which the two communities are not mixed up throughout and in one part of which a particular community dominates must be divided into two, so that each community may gain a dominating position.

(3) Representation in the central government must be according to the number of provinces each community has.

If these principles are accepted Bombay and Bengal will have to be divided into two, namely Bombay will have to give up Sindh while Bengal will yield its Eastern parts, where Muslims are found in an overwhelming

majority. Thus we shall have eleven provinces namely : (1) Frontier Province, (2) The Punjab, (3) The United Provinces, (4) Bihar, (5) Bengal, (6) Eastern-Bengal, (7) Assam, (8) Central Provinces, (9) Bombay, (10) Madras, (11) Sindh. The number can be increased to twelve if Madras can give up Andhra.

Now the Muslims can dominate in four out of these eleven or twelve, while in the remaining eight provinces their representation must be strictly according to their number. It will be something like this—

(1) Frontier, 90 per cent; (2) Punjab, 55 per cent; (3) United Provinces, 15 per cent; (4) Bihar, 9 per cent; (5) Bengal, 20 or 30 per cent: (6) Eastern Bengal, 70 or 80 per cent; (7) Assam, 21 per cent; (8) Central Provinces, 5 per cent; (9) Bombay, 2 or 3 per cent; (10) Madras, 6 per cent; (11) Sindh, 70 or 80 per cent. The above suggestion for Muslims representation in Non-Muslim Provinces is based on the numerical strength and not on any favour or concession from the Hindu who cannot fail to see the justice of it.

A WORD TO MUSLIM CRITICS

Naturally a suggestion whereby in some provinces Muslim representation is reduced to five or ten per cent, according to their numerical strength cannot fail to arouse that section of Muslim critics which believe in giving less and taking more. But they must first of all remember that a demand based on reason and justice has a much better chance of acceptance than one based on mere obstinacy and prejudice. We are in a minority and therefore we shall have to be content with the position of a minority though we have every right to see that we do not remain at the mercy of our rivals. First of all we must not forget that the assignment of four out of eleven or twelve provinces is the best bargain that can be affected under the present circumstances. Secondly it is much better for us to remain in a minority where we are really smaller in number rather than give up our due share in those provinces where we dominate. It is certainly a good bargain to make Punjab dominantly Muslim rather than increase our representation from 15 to 30 per cent in U. P. or from 5 to 10 per cent in Madras and sacrifice our sure domination in Eastern Bengal, Sindh and other Provinces.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, September 1926.

22

FARRUKHABAD : ALLEGATIONS AGAINST OFFICIAL

(*The Aligarh Mail* received the following account of the Farrukhabad riot that took place on the 10th instant. The report is signed by Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, M.L.C., the sitting member from Farrukhabad Muslim constituency and Shaikh Abdullah, B.A., LL.B., of Aligarh who visited the place personally to conduct an investigation on the spot.)

We visited Farrukhabad on 22nd September and made personal enquiries about the fight between the Hindus and the Mahommedans on the 10 September 1926. We read the application presented by the Muslims to the District Magistrate and also the account published in the paper 'Farrukh' whose editor is a Mahommedan and proprietor a Hindu gentleman. We give the facts without comment as they came to our knowledge.

Farrukhabad was founded by Nawab Bangash after the name of the king Farrukh Siyar. With the permission of the Nawab, his finance minister, Shah Bihari Lal built a bisrath (a bathing ghat) for his own use. It is said that Nawab Bangash, or his successor Nawab Hashmat Jung, built another bisrath at a dis ance of 20 yards for the use of the public. The Mahommedans of Farrukhabad from time immemorial, and long before the reign of the Bangash dynasty, used togather every Friday in the month of *Bhadon* to celeberate the ceremony of floating boats in the Ganges—this annual festival was known as the day of Khwaja Khizr. The function used to be largely attended by both Hindus and Muslims. The rich people generally used to go to the fair on Thursday and stayed there until Friday. The Nawab of Farrukhabad too, followed the custom and used to go there regularly every Thursday in the month of *Bhadon* with their families and servants to spend two days in the buildings of Bisrath.

The practice was continued after the possession of Farrukhabad by the British Government. Nawab Sultan Daola, who was descendant of the Ruling Chiefs of Farrukhabad and was receiving pension from the Government, followed the practice till his death a few years ago.

This fair, has always been considered a Muslim Fair though the residents of Farrukhabad participate in it irrespective of caste and creed. Shops of every description, to meet the requirements of the pleasure-seeking people, were opened and the rich people arranged for their own cooking. No place was fixed for the shops but the shopkeepers built their own temporary platforms on the way leading to the Ganges and lying between the two bisraths.

During the current year a Pathshala was opened, which occupied the buildings of one of the bisraths. The Hindus attempted to enclose a space last year between the two bisraths, leveling a small path on either side of this innovation. Mr. A. P. Collett, the then Collector of Fatehgarh, after making enquiries removed the enclosure and allowed the fair to proceed in the usual manner.

Mr. Collett left the district a few months ago and Mr. Budh Sen of the Provincial Service was given officiating charge of the district. On the departure of Mr. Collett the Hindus not only attempted to enclose the space but they built a pacca platform with a *Hawankund* (or sacrificial pit) in the middle of it. While this platform was being built the Muslims reported the matter to the S. D. O. Mr Sri Dhar, the officiating Collector and the Sub-Inspector Mr. Balmukand.

Friday the 10th September was the day for the festival of Khwaja Khizr and the Mussulmans some days before that had repeatedly requested the Sub-Inspector Mr. Balmukand, the S. D. O. Mr. Sri Dhar, the District Magistrate Mr. Budh Sen to settlement of the question before the festival time. The Sub-Inspector asked the Mussulmans to come to him for the settlement of the question. On being informed that the Mussulmans desired that the old practice should be followed, the Sub-Inspector replied that he would consult the officiating Collector and invite the Mussulmans to hear his decision on the spot on the 10 September 1926.

The Mussulmans did not want to celebrate the festival till the decision was made, but about 75 persons went to be bisrath to hear the decision of the Collector. About 2,500 Hindus had previously assembled and taken their places inside the bisrath. All of them were armed with lathis and about 80 of them had swords and lances as well. There was no crowd outside the new passage. He sent back three of them, two of whom were Mahommedans. The S. D. O. had left the headquarters about half-an hour before this incident.

While the Sub-Inspector was discussing the affair with the Mussulmans it is said that one Swami Choley Lal came out of the bisrath and whispered something in the ears of the Sub-Inspector. The Sub-Inspector went inside the bisrath and immediately after his entry bricks began to be hurled from the roofs on the Mahommedans. (These bricks were seen by the Police officers themselves after this incident). A minute later all the armed Hindus, who had concealed themselves inside the bisraths came out and attacked the Mahommedans, majority of whom were not even armed with lathis. The Mahommedans began to run away. The armed Hindus chased them and Nanhey Khan was killed of wounds received by sharp weapons. He fell in a field at a distance of 200 yards from the place where the Mussulmans had assembled to receive the decision of the District Magistrate. Another Mahommedan Nanhoo received serious injuries.

No arrest was made on the spot by the Sub-Inspector. His explanation

according to rumours is that immediately after this incident the Mussulmans ran away and he drove all the Hindus within the bisrath, who were subsequently released by the orders of the Magistrate.

However the fact is that no arrest was made till 22nd September 1926, the day on which we visited the place and no guilty persons was identified by the Sub-Inspector and his constables. It is generally believed that the Sub-Inspector arranged the boats from Ghatia Ghat and sent all the armed Hindus to the other side of the river.

The officiating District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police Mr. Rafiq Ahmed arrived on the spot after half an hour and they made arrangements that panic may not spread in the town. The District Magistrate entrusted the enquiry to the very Sub-Inspector who obviously must have played the part of a looker on, when Hindus were dealing fatal blows to the inoffensive Mussulmans. Mr. Wright, D. I. G., arrived a few days later and he took the enquiry from the hands of the Sub-Inspector and handed it over to the Circle Inspector. On the 11th September the officiating Collector issued a notice under Section 144 prohibiting the public from assembling in groups of five or more or carrying lathis with them. On the 17th September which was the last day for the celebration of this festival, the Hindus armed with lathis went in large numbers to the place and remained there for the whole day. They were not stopped by the Police for doing so. The District Magistrate, it is rumoured, himself asked Bais (Bakers) to go there as usual but the Mussulmans from their experience of the 10th September were afraid to go to the place and there was an idea prevalent among them that they would be killed by the Hindus and their dead bodies would be thrown in the river.

The Mahommedans in a body refrained from celebrating the festival which was their custom from time immemorial. It is also significant that the telegrams which the Mahommedans sent to the Commissioner and the Government were suppressed by the officiating District Magistrate. Every person we met was very much alarmed and there is a great excitement among the Mahommedans, who have the impression that under the circumstances in which the enquiry is being made it will not be possible to get any evidence. Rumours are being circulated that attempts will be made to show that the murdered Nanhey was not even present on the spot. It must be remembered that the dead body of Nanhey was removed from the place where he fell and died under the escort of the police.

Source : **The Aligarh Mail, September 1926.**

23

FARRUKHABAD MUSLIMS MEMORIAL

The following memorial was submitted to the Chief Secretary U.P. and Commissioner Allahabad Division by the Mussulmans of Farrukhabad, in connection with the communal riots.

Sir, The Muslims of Farrukhabad beg to submit as follows :

At Toka Ghat near Farrukhabad on the bank of the Ganges exist two Bisraths, pacca bathing Ghats, commonly known as Shahji's Bisrath. In between these two ghats there was a piece of open land. On this land the Muslims of Farrukhabad have been holding a *Mela* every year since the last 200 years or thereabout, in honour of the prophet Khizir Aleh-is-salam. This *Mela* used to be held on the Four Fridays of the month of *Bhadon*. In this *Mela* the Muslims besides such prayers as befitted the occasions used to have picnics and festivities on the bank of the Ganges.

With the advent of the spirit of Sanghatanism the Hindus began to grudge this annual gathering of the Muslims 'so near the Bisrath and in the year 1924, when Mr. A. P. Collett was the District Magistrate the Hindus made their first serious effort to check this *Mela*. They raised hedges and fixed tutties round and near the place where Muslims used to have their *Mela*. When Mr. Collett was informed of this he got the obsructions removed.

The *Mela* in 1924 and later in 1925 was held as usual. Mr. Collett left the district and his successor Mr. Mudi stayed for a short while in the district. The misguided zeal of the Sangathanist Hindus came once more into relief in the regime of our present Collector Rai Bahadur Budhsen. This time, instead of putting up *Tutties* or barricades a *Chabutra* with a *Havankund* in it has been built on the said open land within the bisraths, the idea, it seems, of the persons responsible for the construction was to give a religious touch to their obstruction of this Muslim *Mela* which religious fringe, it may be noted, was wanting on the first occasion in 1923. This *Chabutra* was under construction in the month of August and the learned District Magistrate was duly informed of the potentialities of this construction. Unfortunately for the Muslims their representations failed to excite as much sympathy or imagination of the learned District Magistrate as it did in the case of Mr. Collett, with the result that the construction of *Chabutra* was not stopped. We would be failing in our duty if we do not here mention that the sympathetic assurances given by the learned District Magistrate to our representatives in the month of August had created an impression on us that he would take every necessary step to stop this Sanghatanist encroachment on our right.

However, as days passed by we were surprised to see that no direct action was taken to stop the construction.

Our representatives had been to the learned S.D.O. and the City Kotwal as well, but we make bold to submit that for reasons best known to the authorities concerned and not far to seek or guess the construction of the *Chabutra* if not permitted was connived. Eventually after the completion of the *Chabutra* with its *Havankund* Hindus urged that the *Chabutra* being the place of their worship, Mussulmans should be stopped from holding the *Mela* near or at the Bisraths and the *Chabutra*.

The principal *Mela* used to be held on the last Friday of *Bhadon* and beginning from about 8 in the morning it used to last till about 7 p.m. Thus *Mela* attracted large numbers. As opposed to this the first three *Fridays* did neither attract any large number nor used to be so protracted. We may point out that one of the known grounds of objection against the *Mela* was the eating of Kababs (meat preparation) by the Muslims within *Mela* and quite naturally the cooking thereof was also objected to. This year owing to unsettled conditions very few Mussulmans went to the *Mela* on the first, second and the third Fridays and did neither install any cooking shop nor, infact in any of those 3 days, ate Kababs. Inspite of this guarded attitude of the Mussulmans the Hindus after the first 2 Fridays began to collect at the bisraths and thereabout. As this was an unusual development, the D.M. was duly informed and so was the S.D.O. and the Kotwal. We very much deplore to submit that this information was considered an exaggeration and was lightly treated. In these days when communal strife has surcharged the atmosphere a little caution, it is submitted, would have avoided that spilling of blood and loss of life on the 3rd Friday of *Bhadon* which we all now deplore. The facts of the riot are under enquiry and we refrain from entering into details. We however submit that when this act of Hindu aggression was being performed at Tokaghat the learned S.D.O. though at Fatehgarh till late in the evening did not think it worthwhile to proceed to the spot either during the day or in the evening after the riot when every street-boy knew of it. The Sub-Divisional Magistrate instead, proceeded to his camp at Madanpura in connection with rainy season tour 20 miles away from Saddar. We apprehend that the Kotwal probably did not like and did not inform the D.M. or the S.D.O. of the Hindu assemblage at the Ghats. That is the only explanation for the absence of a Magistrate on the spot. We are pretty sure that Mr. Morgan the learned S.P. whom our representatives could not approach as he was away in the mofussil was kept in the dark by those whose duty it was to keep him informed.

After the riot, orders under Sec. 144 were promulgated and a casual reading of them would show that in effect they amounted to a denial of those rights and privileges which the Mussulmans have been observing in these *Melas*. Realising the gravity of the situation that the Muslims have not observed the *Mela* on the last Friday. It would be interesting to note that a

huge new Hindu Mela was held on the last Friday (17 September 1926) on the sight where the Muslim *Mela* was to be held.

British Justice is our mainstay and that we implore.

Source: The Aligarh Mail, September 1926.

24

ALLAHABAD RIOT: MUSLIM EXPLANATION

In *The Leader* of the 20 September 1926, there has appeared a letter from Mr. Harnandan Pershad in which he has not only tried to make out a case for the Hindus as regards the playing of music before mosques, but has quite ingeniously with subtle reasoning cast certain aspersions against local Muslim leaders. These aspersions are, I am sure, entirely unwarranted and unjustifiable. I do not wish to discuss in this letter the controversial question of music before mosques, or to show that the Muslim demand of the stopping of music is an old one based on reasons of goodwill and tolerance in religious matters.

Mr. Harnandan Pershad has expressed his surprise that although there are a number of Muslim Vakils, Barristers and Raises of Allahabad none has so far condemned the movement of stopping music before mosques, nor has any one chosen to condemn the excesses committed by the rowdy elements of his community. Had Mr. Harnandan Pershad considered the question impartially and with an open mind, he could not have expressed his surprise at all. May I know if Mr. Harnandan Pershad, who is himself a Vakil, ever cared to condemn the Hindus who were responsible for the brutal and unprovoked assault on the innocent Mussulmans during the Bakr-Id days or did he notice anyone out of so many leading Hindus ever condemning such excess committed by the said persons. The rights of the Mussulmans of Jhusi were quite obvious, and not so controversial as that of Music, yet no stone was left unturned to defend the Hindu aggressors who were arrested in connection with the case. *The Leader* as well in its editorial note, even when the case is in appeal, has expressed his opinion that the sentences passed against the Hindus are too severe, probably to induce the High Court to take a lenient view when the appeal comes up for hearing. As a matter of fact the Mussulmans at Allahabad feel and believe that in view of the deliberate and determined attitude of the Hindus that they must play music before mosques just at prayer time, it will never be just and proper to ask the Moslems to let, the Hindus insult their mosques and disturb them in their prayers.

The result of past year's convictions in the communal cases conclusively proved that the Hindus had perpetrated more heinous offences than the Mussulmans.

As regards the attack on Babu Kamta Pershad Kacker I wish to assure Mr. Harnandan Pershad and the entire Hindu community that the Mussulmans deplore this incident no less than they do. The Mussulmans condemn those persons who committed this cowardly assault and have already expressed in their municipal meeting unqualified condemnation of this unfortunate incident on the occasion. Of the last be it known to Mr. Harnandan Pershad that even in these days of communal disturbance all the Muslim municipal Commissioners unanimously elected Babu Kamta Pershad as the Chairman of the Board while there was strong division among the Hindus themselves. Babu Kamta Pershad did not recognise his assailants and it is probable he was assaulted by those Hindus who are admittedly his enemies and who would have likely availed themselves of this opportunity. As for the assaults on other Hindu leaders it is for the first time that Mr. Harnandan Pershad tells us that they were assaulted It seems, however, that Mr. Harnandan Pershad has no idea of an excited mob when people assault without rhyme and reason and sometimes even without distinction of caste and creed. As to his query 'whether the authorities were doing anything to find out how these brickbats etc., came to be collected and were thrown from the very mosque where the leaders were sitting'. I wish to enlighten my friend that there was no collection of brickbats at all and excepting Maulana Shah Wilayat Husain Sahib who could not have been at any other place except the mosque just one minute before the prayers all other Muslim leaders were in the street below the mosque at the time when the procession was passing. As a matter of fact only some *badnash* were thrown and if one or two brickbats were seen it was either that they were thrown from the adjoining house of the mosque or were taken out from the adjoining wall because they appeared to be covered with lime. The authorities know the distinction between the Moslem Leaders and Pandit Basant Lal Sharma, and I hope they will think twice before they put them in the category of Basant Lal Sharma.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, September 1926.

25

AN OPEN LETTER TO INDIAN LEADERS

The problem of Hindu-Muslim relations has been engaging the attention of all serious-minded and patriotic Indians for a long time. But the bitter experience of the last three years of separatist and communal movements and specially its recent manifestations even among the educated youths of the country require a speedy and lasting solution of this perennial question. We in our way, are placing our humble views before you and invite your criticism and valuable suggestions to improve our scheme, which your long experience of public life and your earnest study of Indian problems has given.

To our mind the solutions coming so far lack either in practicability or in inspiration. In any case the problem has not been tackled with a view to find out a practical clear, dispassionate and uncompromising solution. The leaders have not either nationally thought over it or have not placed their full heart. Their responsible behaviour and a secret desire not to offend the set prejudices of any community has led them into beautiful and not very unpalatable platitudes.

We youngmen are hampered neither by the one nor the other. To our mind and way of thinking there is logically but one and the only way of solution......the evolution of a true conscious nation and correspondingly, the suppression, absolute suppression of all separatist and particularist thinking. Under the present circumstances, this, we admit, is a vision and an age-long uphill work. In short, it means the inculcation of the idea of Indian culture, Indian civilisation, the appreciation of the citizen and not the religious idea and the evolution of an Indian and not a Christian or a Mussulman or a Hindu. It also means the advance of the territorial and not the religious idea.

With such view we only confine our efforts to the youth of the country and the educated youth who can be impressed upon the political ideas. Our programme thus does not consider the solution of immediate questions but deals with the positive and constructive side from a broader and clearer standpoint. It is thus an essentially detached intellectual movement in its conception which does not evade but ignore the realities of the present situation. We find our inspiration and strength in an idea and we want to improve it.

It is proposed to start as an experiment a League of Indian Youths whose membership will be open to all educated youngmen and women irrespective of any class or creed. It will be an all Indian Organisation with

branches all over the country.

Its programme shall consist of the following : It will arrange occasional academic lectures and discussions on the various problems of the country, the study and appreciation of Indian culture and civilisation. It will provide a reading room and a library for its members where books and papers truly national in outlook will be provided. Occasionally it will arrange inter dinners and social gatherings for its members and sympathisers. The League shall also launch an active propaganda through pamphlets and speeches against separate political institutions and tendencies and untouchability. The members will solemnly undertake to advance the objects of the League by their example and efforts. They would undertake not to injure by violent opposition the feelings and susceptibilities of any religious body or community. In their views, however, they will be firm, dignified and uncompromising and if necessary, will ruthlessly expose the harmful activities of foolish and crafty mischief-mongers of the country. The League will start a paper in order to press upon the public among other useful objects the necessity of :

1. Abolishing the separate electorate and other denominational institutions.
2. Starting truly mixed national schools and boarding houses;
3. Abolishing untouchability in all its forms;
4. Eliminating extra-territorial patriotism;
5. Of relegating religion to the dimension of private life.

The working constitution of the League will be discussed and adopted latter, but a rough idea will be gathered from the following observations. The members of the League will sign and abide by the following declaration :

1. I shall place the common interests of my country and its social, political and industrial advancement as the foremost creed of my belief. Religion shall influence my private life only.

2. I shall always have a respectful attitude towards the common morality and the religious spirit, though uncompromisingly condemn the exclusive dogmatic life.

3. In present communal differences, controversies, and conflict I will have an open mind and be absolutely just and impartial and will expose the wrongs of a community.

4. I hold communalism as destructive to and separate from the true nation-building, and a healthy patriotic spirit.

5. I will always respect and defend the honour of Indian sisters and mothers against every intimidation and interference.

The advantages of the League shall be open to another class of members who will be known as the sympathisers of the League who, however, will not direct the policy of the League and will be excluded from the membership of the executive and business meetings.

Our young countrymen who agree and sympathy with the objects of the League and are willing to co-operate with us are also requested to kindly

send us their names and full addresses. The formal constitution will be framed when sufficient members from the various parts of the country are enrolled.

Source: The Aligarh Mail, October 1926.

26

WANTED AN ALL-INDIA UNITED MUSLIM PARTY

We, the Mussulmans of India, are so helpless that we are unable to raise even our little finger when the most sacred monuments of our religion are being demolished and the resting places of the holiest men and women of Islam are being disturbed, so said Raja of Jahangirabad during the course of the address that he delivered as the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Conference that met at Lucknow to consider the Hedjaz question. The Raja did but voice the truth. We in India, who are unable to defend our own rights in this country, cannot expect to be of any service in liberating Hedjas or helping any other community or country. India itself not excepted. To be of any service to humanity, we should try to organize our scattered forces in this country and to check the forces of disintegration that have found so much favour with our community. In order to help others, we must help ourselves.

Are we taking steps to establish co-ordination between religious, social and political activities of our community? Certainly the answer is not in affirmative. Once in a while we make spasmodic efforts to bring about some sort of order into the chaotic condition of our social and political life but our efforts are short lived and our resolutions do not survive long. Why? Because almost always we begin at the wrong end. Instead of utilizing our energies in the most profitable way, we usually spend them where these can be of least possible use to us.

It is not proposed to criticise the Hedjaz Conference, as it has its good points. It has at least brought together some elements that have been considered irreconcilable so far, and, therefore, has possibilities of good to the community. But it is, after all, very little that the promoters of the Conference can do by way of finding a solution to the Hedjaz problem, even if they succeed in finding a common formula upon which they all agree. How much more good they could have done, if they had directed their attention to the consideration and formulation of a common programme of action for the internal politics of India. In fact this would have also served in a very effective way the cause for which the Conference was called.

Unable as we are to help our brethren abroad, yet we can do a great deal for ourselves at home. India is passing through a transitional period and if the Mussulmans want to have their proper share in the Government and the prosperity of the country, they must, now, prepare themselves for it.

An election is waiting just around the corner, while the Royal Statutory Commission would be coming to India not many years hence. Organized efforts are being made on the part of other communities not only to safeguard their own interests but also to usurp the rights of other communities. The 'Gaoo Raksha (cow protection) party and the Sanghatan Maha Sabha Party, otherwise known as the Congress Independent Party, are in the field to put up candidates not by any means friendly to Muslim interests. The Swarajist Party is playing even a more dangerous game. It wants to create a division amongst the Muslims. It wishes to appropriate a number of Muslim seats to itself, which practically means that it is attempting to reduce Muslim representation in legislatures.

What are the Mussulmans doing to safeguard their legitimate interests and rights ? Nothing. In Bengal they are trying to organise themselves, but elsewhere no attempt is yet being made to form a Muslim Party. A Party which should have a broad nationalist outlook and work for India but at the same time retain its Muslim character; that is, while safeguarding Muslim interests, it should be second to none in fighting India's battle for freedom.

Such a party is needed in every province of India. We, in the United Provinces, need it just as badly as the Bengali Muslims do in Bengal. In fact our need is greater, because we are in such a deplorable minority in these provinces. It is absolutely, necessary that Muslims of these provinces should elect to the Council only those who are best able to safeguard the interests of the community and to serve the country. To do it efficiently, an organisation is needed. May it be hoped that the leaders of the community would come forward and shoulder the task ? May we also hope that efforts would be made to form an All India United Muslim Party to watch over the all India interests of the Mussulmans.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, September 1926 (Editorial).

27

THE ALIGARH RAMLILA

The official announcement by the Aligarh Ramlila Committee through a

correspondent of the *Leader* abandoning the celebration of the Ramlila creates no surprise. The Committee protested against the restrictions imposed by the District Magistrate in not allowing the playing of Music before mosques at the time of prayers. The Ramlila Committee insisted on taking out their procession to the accompaniment of music before the mosques at all times irrespective of the Mussulmans saying their prayer.

The Mussulmans do not want to obstruct the Hindus in the celebration of their festival but they simply demand that the old and time-honoured traditions as to the stoppage of music before mosques should be strictly adhered to.

Now I ask the Ramlila Committee to show, if they were really prepared to hold their fair as usual. My information is that they were not, for no new dresses were ordered and the old ones were not repaired which are months before. The effigy of Ravan was not ordered to be made, why then accuse the authorities of imposing restrictions and call into question the attitude of the Mussulmans, which was in no way uncompromising. If the Hindus want to peacefully celebrate the Ramlila without creating difficulties for the district authorities, the most reasonable thing is to accept the old arrangements which are sanctified by custom.

The Mussulmans took out licences for the Mohurrum, Teeja and Chelum and the Hindu policemen of the lines submitted to a similar accommodation by taking a licence on the occasion of Janam Ashtami.

I assure the Ramlila Committee that the Mussulman and the Hindu policemen far from suffering any humiliation in accepting the official arrangements which embodied the old traditional programme, gave a practical demonstration of their sweet reasonableness.

I am told that quite an important section of the Hindus did not see eye to eye with the Ramlila Committee and were anxious to celebrate the fair on the lines heretofore followed by the Committee and have prevailed in discouraging their enterprise.

We are lucky in having Mr. Darwin as our Collector. During the short time that he has been in our midst, he has earned universal popularity and has impressed everyone who came into contact with him by his warm sympathies and broadminded gentleness. With a district magistrate of such a calibre the citizens of Aligarh both Hindus and Mussulmans should reciprocate with the feelings of beneficial co-operation.

If the Ramlila Committee still insist on kicking at the old traditions and feel that their sense of independence is wounded they have to thank their own sensitiveness.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, October 1926.

28

REFORMS AND THE FRONTIER PROVINCE

A public meeting of the residents of Peshawar was held on the 22nd instant at which resolutions were passed demanding a similar measure of reforms as have been granted to other provinces of India. This demand is not a new one but has been agitating the minds of the Frontier people ever since the introduction of the reforms in the administration of the other provinces. It was in reply to this demand that the Frontier Enquiry Committee was appointed with Sir Denys Bray as its Chairman. It was also an expression of this demand which was contained in the resolution of Mr. Murtaza when he moved his resolution on the Frontier reform question in the Assembly last winter. There is no doubt to the fact that there is a keen sense of disappointment among the Frontier people at the unfair way in which their legitimate demand for the grant of the reforms has been treated by the Government. The discontentment resulting from this disappointment has been growing daily and if nothing is done to satisfy these people, the situation may become quite serious.

The question of the reforms in the Frontier Provinces can be viewed from two different angles, viz., the economic and the political aspects of the problem. Taking that last aspect first, it must be remembered that the people of the Province have more things in common with the people of Afghanistan than they have with the inhabitants of India. Ethnologically, and culturally they are the same as the Afghans. Their religion is the same as that of the Afghans. Their sympathies, therefore, are naturally with Afghanistan and unless the British rule is made specially attractive to them, there is little chance that they would give up their pro-Afghan tendencies. True statesmanship and diplomacy, therefore, demands that these people should always be kept well contented. But instead of taking steps to make them contented, special efforts have been made to give them a just cause to grumble and feel dissatisfied. They, the liberty loving people of the Frontier, have been denied even the rudiments of reforms that the rest of India has been enjoying ! They are told that because of their backwardness in education, they cannot have reformed Government, as they would be unable to carry out the responsibility that such a change in the Government of their province would place on their shoulders. They, however, do not believe in this...because they know it fully well that the majority of people in the provinces that are enjoying the reforms are also illiterate and ignorant. And yet they have been granted the reforms. They therefore see no reason why the reforms should be denied to them.

They also say that the educational backwardness of the Province is the direct result of the policy followed by the Government, and they, therefore, naturally resent being penalized for the unwise action of the Government. There is a keen feeling amongst 93% of the people of the Province that the Government refuses to do them justice in order to please the Hindu reactionaries and Sanghatanists who oppose the introduction of the reforms in the Frontier, because it would mostly benefit the Mussulman majority in the province, which, for some reasons best known to themselves, is very unpalatable to them.

Taking the economic aspect of the question, we find that with a discontented Frontier Province our military bill goes up too high, while with a satisfied and well contented population on our frontiers it is reduced considerably. It is a well-known fact that India is staggering under the burden of a heavy military budget and it is also admitted that this expenditure cannot be reduced unless and until our frontiers are adequately protected by contented people. Could there be any greater protection than the knowledge and the belief that the Frontier Province is inhabited by a people who appreciate the blessings of a good and democratic Government and who would shed the last drop of their blood for the protection of the Government that bestow on them that greatest of all the great privileges, the right of self-government.

Again, the cost of administering the Frontier Province, at present, mostly falls on the Government of India, and there is no prospect of shifting this burden on the Provincial Government so long as the present autocratic form of government does not give place to a form of government more responsive to public opinion. For economic prosperity can only increase when there is peace in the Province and when the Government is less occupied with the task of maintaining public peace and order than it is now. It will, then, have time to devote its attention to building the industries of the Province, and directing the energies of the people to profitable pursuits of trade and commerce. This leisure the Government cannot hope to have, unless the people are satisfied with the prevailing system of Government. Thus, it would appear that even for the economic prosperity of the Province, which would necessarily mean an increase in the Government revenue, it is absolutely necessary that the reforms should be granted to the Province as soon as possible.

Let it not be forgotten for a moment that the Frontier people are our guards. They are guarding the gate of India against aggression from the North West. It is to the advantage of India that these guards should be kept in good humour. It is not suggested that they should be pampered and petted but at the sametime they should not be given any legitimate chance to grumble and be dissatisfied for we should remember that a discontented and dissatisfied guard is not a very good protection.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, October 1926.

29

LETTER FROM M. A. JINNAH TO THE MAHOMMEDANS OF BOMBAY

Mr. M.A. Jinnah, a candidate for the Legislative Assembly from the Bombay City Mahommedan Constituency, has addressed the following open letter to his constituents :

It is with no small pain that I have to meet the deplorable tactics of my opponents, who in order to gain their own end have been insidiously poisoning the mind of a section of the Mahommedans in the name of religion against me. If a definite allegation was made, it would be easy to meet it; but the sinister methods that are adopted for the purpose of misleading my supporters and friends and the voters generally, is a most discreditable attempt on the part of those who are carrying on the electioneering campaign on such lines. However it has been brought to my notice by responsible men that such is the case and that it needs a reply. I therefore venture to put before you facts which will go to establish the falsehood of what is being circulated against me.

In the first instance it is said that I am against Islam, a baser and a meaner allegation it is not possible for any Mussulman to make. Only recently in the course of a debate in the Legislative Assembly in its last sessions, when the question of the amendment of Indian Succession Act came up, to quote as an example, I, who am always zealous and vigilant to watch the interests of the Mussulmans, had to stoutly resist the suggestion that the Act should be applied to the Mahommedans and in order to convince those who have any honest doubt on the subject I will quote from the official Report of what took place. Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar in his speech said :

'I think there is a clear ground for accusation that Government are partial to Mahommedans in this respect. My Mussulman friends will take note of that for I do not think there is any justification at all why oral will should be encouraged among Mahommedans. I think every will ought to be reduced to writing and I throw this out for the consideration of the Government and of the Assembly that if it is good for the Hindus only to make written wills, it is also good for Mahommedans to make written wills,' and to that I gave the following reply :

'I had no desire to take part in this discussion, but I think that my Honorable friend Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar has got Mahommedans on the brain. That a lawyer of his eminence and experience should come forward and say that the Government are showing partiality to Mahommedans

in enacting this Bill surpasses my comprehension. Whether this provision is acceptable to my Hindu friends or whether it is not acceptable to them is another matter. I shall be the last person to force any kind of legislation upon the Hindu community against their wishes. But he knows perfectly well that there is nothing in his religion which prevents the Hindu community from accepting this legislation if it is desirable. In the case of Mahommedans he knows perfectly well that it would be overriding the highest authority which binds the Mussulmans, and that is the Koran. You will therefore raise a question of a far graver character if you try to impose that provision upon Mahommedans.'

As to the question as to what I have done for the Mahommedans it will be very difficult for me to describe here the various services that I have rendered, but in order to give some idea I will narrate some events of the greatest importance to the Mahommedans hoping that you will not consider it self-praise, as I am forced to state, what I have done for the Mussulmans.

1. The Mussulmans were agitating against the decision of the Privy Council in the matter of Wakfs which wrongly interpreted the Mussulman Law for sixteen years without redress. It was in 1913 that the Wakf Bill which I introduced as soon as I entered the Minto-Morley Council, was passed into an Act piloted by me through the legislature.

2. The Lucknow pact, which defined the position of the Mahommedans in the various legislatures in 1916.

3. The Indian Moslem League which was practically dead, was revived in 1924 through my efforts; and it was under my presidentship that it laid down and crystallised the position of the Mahommedans clearly and definitely with regard to the future advance in the constitution of the Government of India towards establishment of Responsible Government.

4. It was through my instrumentality that in the National Demand which was made in the Assembly, a clause was inserted that the Mahommedan interests and rights should be safeguarded in any future constitution that may be framed.

5. It was owing to my co-operation with my Hindu friends that the Indian Nationalist Party in the Assembly consisting of about 76 members in 1925 unanimously passed a resolution recognising the separate electorates in the various Legislatures so long the Mahommedans desired to continue them.

6. It was through me, who happened to be elected unanimously by all sections and schools of Mahommedans at Delhi in 1925 as their spokesman at the Unity Conference that the Mahommedan case was placed before the Unity Conference.

7. In January-March 1926 Sessions, it was through my efforts that the North-West-Frontier Province Reform Resolution was carried and I am glad to say with the support of several Hindu members of my party, against the most vigorous opposition led by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and supported by several leading Hindus. The Official Reports will show that I

bore the brunt in the debate.

I therefore appeal to my electorates not to be misled by men who are maliciously spreading rumours against me and I trust that the Mahommedans will be able to distinguish their friends and those who are self-seekers and for their own personal gain are trying to misrepresent me and mislead the Mussulman community.

I can assure you that if I am returned as your representative, I will watch your interest with the same zeal and vigilance as I have done in the past and that nothing will make me abandon the Mussulman cause and the Mussulman interests.

Apart from the fact that justice must be done to the Mussulmans I am convinced that Mussulman cause and Mussulman progress is the cause of India. No single community should be allowed to remain backward or should be prevented from coming forward if we wish to attain Swaraj. Backwardness of the Mussulmans is not only detrimental to the community from the communal point of view but it is equally a handicap and injurious to the National interests.

I trust that I have now once for all made my position clear. I assure you that I am seeking the election for no other object except to have the opportunities of serving you and the country to the best of my abilities and judgment.

I therefore hope that you will be good enough to support me.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, November 1926.

30

ASAF ALI LOSES ELECTION

The expected has exactly happened. Our forecast has come out to be perfectly true. Mr. Asaf Ali, the Swarajist candidate (has lost) Mr. Rang Beharilal, the adopted Son of Sangathan, has been duly elected to the Legislative Assembly from the Ajmer-Delhi Constituency. Only a few days ago our Swarajist contemporary the I.D.T. of Lucknow, asked the Hindu voters of the Ajmer-Delhi Constituency to show their 'catholic instincts' and give an 'object lesson' in 'communal magnanimity' to the Mussulmans. Mr. Asaf Ali's rout at the polls conclusively proves that the Hindu voters of Delhi have neither 'catholic instincts' nor 'communal magnanimity', for had they even posed to possess any of these virtues, they would have certainly sent Mr. Asaf Ali as their representative to the Assembly. In circumstances

already referred to in these columns, we anticipated that the Hindus would, by electing Mr. Asaf Ali, give the Mussulmans an object-lesson in communal trickery rather than in 'communal magnanimity'. We are not sorry if our anticipation has not been fulfilled because its fulfilment would have caused some of the Mussulmans to fall prey to Hindu duping. It is gratifying to note that the Mussulmans have been saved the danger of being once more duped by dishonest Hindu politicians who profess what they do not mean. Much more pleasing is the fact that Mr. Asaf Ali's defeat has nailed to the counter their dirty lie that they are enamoured of common representation and common electorates because of their inherent spirit of nationalism. Mr. Rang Beharilal's success should serve as a reminder to the Mussulmans of the fact, which has become an axiomatic truth, that in a common electorate where the number of Hindu voters is preponderating, as is the case in the Ajmer-Delhi Constituency, there is not the ghost of a chance for the success of a Muslim candidate. Mr. Asaf Ali has been defeated by as many as 234 votes. He would have suffered a more crushing defeat, had the Muslim voters not come to his aid and voted for him just as the Hindus unanimously voted for Mr. Rang Beharilal. Our Hindu brethren are noted for their political shrewdness. It, however, appears that at Delhi, as elsewhere in the country, the heat of Sangathan has raised the temperature of Hindu communalism to such an extent that our Hindu countrymen have begun to show signs of forgetting even their false professions about nationalism. For the sake of demonstrating the national value of common electorates, the Hindus of Delhi ought to have elected Mr. Asaf Ali. His election would have proved that the Hindus were, at least in appearance, communally magnanimous as the I.D.T. wants them to be and that they believed in what they professed. The Hindu majority in the Assembly would not have been any the worse for Mr. Asaf Ali's election. But because our Hindu brethren are typically greedy in their political aspirations, and because they want to perpetuate their monopoly of political power they cannot brook that their representatives in the Assembly should be decreased even by one man. They have, therefore, elected their own co-religionist. Be it noted that the Ajmer-Delhi Constituency is the only joint electorate in the country. By electing Mr. Rang Beharilal, the Hindus have amply shown the futility of the Delhi Joint-electorate in creating a sense of common citizenship among Hindus and Mussulmans. Hindu voters of Delhi may feel elated at Mr. Rang Beharilal's success. Little they realise that it is a death-knell to the existence of the Delhi joint-electorate. If we can hazard a prophecy and see the inside of things, we may point out that it lies already murdered. And we have no hesitation in saying that it is the Hindus who are guilty of the murder. We have, however, no reason, to be grieved. On the other hand, we rejoice and exclaim.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, November 1926.

31

SCHEME FOR INSTITUTIONAL REORGANISATION

More than once attention has been drawn in these columns about the imperative need for the Muslims to organise their forces in order to combat the danger that beset them these days. It has been said that to perfect their organisation they do not need to form new associations but they should utilize the institutions that they already possess. If it is necessary, they should modify and remove them so as to suit the changed conditions but what they must do is to make every effort possible to create co-operation and co-ordination between the activities of these associations.

Every attempt should be made to eliminate duplicate institutions working in the same field. For example, education should be left entirely in the charge of the All-India Mahommedan Educational Conference while internal politics shoulu be taken over by the Muslim League, and our extra-territorial interests should be looked after by the Khilafat Committee with which should be amalgamated the Khuddam-ul-Harmain and other associations which have, as their object, the protection of our extra-territorial interests. Great saving in time, money and energy will result by the elimination of these duplicate societies for the same purpose. The division of labour will make it easier for Muslim organisations to become better and more efficient working machines. To create co-ordination and secure co-operation between their activities, these various bodies should elect representatives to a central organisation which may be named as the Tanzeem Committee. The Tanzeem would see that the programmes of the Muslim associations do not overlap. It will watch for waste and try to eliminate it. In short, it will act as the general supervising body to secure efficiency.

The scheme worked out in details will be something like this. Every Tahsil or Taaluqa will have its own Taaluqa Moslem League, Educational Conference, Economic Welfare Committee, Social Service League etc. These will elect the Taaluqa Tanzeem Committee. Members of these societies will also elect representatives from amongst them to district organisations, who in their turn would elect the District Tanzeem League. The district organisations will similarly elect provincial bodies which in their turn will join in electing the provincial Tanzeem Committees, and these will elect the All-India organisation. It would appear that the scheme instead of starting at the top, aims to begin building the edifice from the bottom and continue the work until the whole building is completed. This would give permanence and surer foundation to the work when it is finished than the proverbially

too heavy and tottering institution which we possess to-day. Instead of dragging a miserable existence, Muslim organisations will then be alive, full of vigour and really useful to the Muslim community. The scheme here given is only a rough sketch so as to give an idea what it will be like. In our next issue, we hope to discuss in more details the work as it should be undertaken, but for the present we would like to urge once again our co-religionists to think seriously and earnestly about mobilizing their forces and to give up quarrelling amongst themselves. It is no time to fight between ourselves and we must work unitedly to solve the problems that are facing us if we want to live an honourable life.

II

In the previous issue, we gave a rough outline of a scheme for Muslim organisation wherein we laid emphasis on the elimination of institutions whose sphere of activities overlapped. We also called the attention of our leaders and co-religionists to the extreme necessity of binding Muslim institutions spread all over the country into one common chain of co-ordination so as to give coherence to their activities and make concerted action on the part of Muslims not only a possibility but a certainty.

The scheme at first appears undoubtedly rather fantastic but when examined more closely it would prove to be thoroughly practical, because it does not aim at building a magnificent house all at once but proposes to work patiently, laying down brick after brick until the whole edifice is completed. For those who aspire and think themselves capable of organising an all India association with its branches spread all over the country it should not be a difficult matter to organise the Muslims of such a small area as a Taaluqa or Tehsil. If they succeed in organizing a Taaluqa, they would surely lay the foundation of the building that they propose to erect.

What it needed is a band of earnest and sincere workers who are ready to sacrifice a little of their comfort and willing to undergo some hardships for the cause. The task is, of course, an impossible one if such men are not forthcoming to offer their services for this glorious work. We are likely to be told that we do not possess such men. If so, then why attempt at establishing other high sounding but almost lifeless associations which show signs of life for only a couple of weeks within a whole year and then remain in a state of stupor for the rest of the year ? What is the use of running these costly Tamashas, and waste the money collected from the poor Muslim community.

We, on our part, are not so pessimistic, and believe that conditions are not quite as bad as some amongst us picture. The Muslim community has a sufficient number of men who would not shirk to undertake the labour of love and who would be willing and enthusiastically come forward to sacrifice their comfort for the sake of their community. Suppose we can secure the

services of only twenty such men in the whole of the United Provinces and start the work at once. Suppose an average district is composed of 5 Tahsils. We would, therefore, simultaneously begin our work in 4 districts. Every one of these 5 organizers will be given charge of one Tahsil in the district and every one of them will be expected to put the work well on its way within four months, so that it would be left in the hands of the local committees. Now the 5 men working in the district will help the Tahsil committees to organise the district branches and then, entrusting the work of supervision to the district bodies, they would leave the district and go to work in another district. Thus within a year, these twenty honest and sincere workers would be able to organise 12 districts or a third of the province and within three years the whole of the Muslim community in these provinces would have a perfect organisation which will prove to be the envy of other communities in India.

The next question that may be asked in this connection is where will you find sufficient number of men to carry on the work of the numerous committees that you wish to form. Attempt should, of course, be made to enlist every Muslim living in the Tahsil as member of the Taaluqa or Tahsil committee, but it is evident that all of them cannot be entrusted with the conduct of the work of the various associations though they would most certainly be expected to co-operate and help the officials of these associations. But we should try to interest as many local men as possible to participate actively in the work of these various committees and particular effort should be made to have different men on different committees as far as it is possible. The one main fault of the Muslims has been that only a few amongst them take upon themselves all the work, while the rest of the community, except for spasmodic and periodical interest, never bother themselves much about the work for the general welfare of the community. The natural result is that the men who have over-burdened themselves with all sorts of work find it impossible to do anything properly, and consequently what little they do does not prove to be much effective or useful. If larger number of men divided into smaller groups are made to interest themselves in the work for the community, there is bound to be a better response from the community, and greater results will be achieved.

III

In this article, last of the series, we wish to call the attention of our readers to the method that should be adopted in the financing of Muslim associations. It is often said, much to our shame, that the money collected for a certain purpose is not usually utilized for the purpose but is misused by those who are put in charge of the funds. Cases are not wanting when it has been actually proved that large sums of money have been misappropriated by the very persons who were entrusted with the responsibility of seeing

that the money is properly used. The result is that the Muslim public has become rather suspicious and does not respond liberally even to appeals that are made for really laudable purposes.

Hardly a day passes when the Muslim public is not asked to subscribe to this fund or that fund. Besides the tremendous cost of conducting subscription campaigns, these are a great nuisance to the public. It has become sick of these fresh appeals which it has begun to look upon as profitteering upon Muslim patriotism. If steps are not taken to remove the suspicion of the public, the chances are that Muslim institutions will, in near future, be starved for lack of financial support. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that something should be done at once to restore the confidence of the public in its institutions and their workers.

The first thing that we should do is to remove the danger of misappropriation by making the Trustees of funds responsible to law. Public should be asked to subscribe only to those associations that have been legally registered under the Companies Act. This will provide a reasonable protection to funds subscribed. The next measure that we should take is to discountenance the nuisance of everyday subscription campaigns.

In order to accomplish this end, central offices of All-India associations should not be allowed to approach the public directly for the collection of funds. They should make their budgets and submit them to the All-India Tanzeem Committee which will ask its provincial branches to contribute proportionally to the central treasury the total amount required by the central offices of the associations. The Provincial Tanzeem Committees would, in their turn, add to this sum an amount sufficient for the needs of the provincial branches of the various associations and then fix the contributions that the district branches of the Tanzeem would have to make so as to contribute the total amount. The district branches in the same way should add to this amount the money required by the district associations and then ask the Taaluqa or Tahsil committee to send in their respective shares to the district treasury.

Taaluqa or Tahsil Tanzeem Committees should ask the Taaluqa or Tahsil branches of the various associations to send in their respective requirements for the year to the local Tanzeem office. To the aggregate of this, they should add their respective quotas for the district, provincial and central contributions and then name a week as 'the collection week' during which they should try to collect the required amount locally. After deducting the money required for their own needs, they should forward the money to the district office which after, taking its share of the contribution should send the remainder to the Provincial Treasury and the Provincial Office should send its contribution to the Central Office.

The system if followed will at once eliminate waste caused by conducting so many different campaigns and give an efficient organization for the collection of the money needed by the various Muslim institutions and societies. It

will also provide a more or less effective check against those who are in the habit of going to the public for money to help the institutions that are non-existent or that are unworthy of receiving public support.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, December 1926 (Editorials).

32

VICEROY AND MUSLIMS ON COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION

As the date of the examination of the working of the Reforms by the Statutory Commission of 1929 approaches nearer and nearer, we Muslims should become more and more anxious to safeguard our political rights. It is high time that we adopt all means to ensure that our position both in the legislatures and Government services was such as the numerical strength and political and historical importance of our community warranted. We should be immediately on our watch because it is an open fact that Hindu communalists have launched a regular and organised campaign against communal representation and communal electorates in order that Government may be intimidated to abolish them to the ruination of the political existence of the Muslims in this country. If we are awakened to political realities obtaining at present in the country, we should between now and 1929 so organise ourselves that Government may feel the unavoidable necessity of not only retaining the present communal electorates but also of abolishing the Delhi joint-electorate which has ignonimously failed to inculcate among the Hindus a true spirit of common citizenship the diffusion of which among the people is the main object of common representation and mixed electorates.

It is gratifying to note that the Muslims of Bengal are not much oblivious of the issue which faces Indian Mussulmans today and which we have briefly explained above. The National Mahommedan Association of Calcutta did well to present an address to His Excellency the Viceroy and to refer therein to the grievances of our community. And we are glad that His Excellency's reply to the address is marked by his characteristic sympathy with the aspirations of the people of this country for which he has become famous even during the first year of his Vice-royalty. Noting the anxiety of the Mussulmans as regards communal representation, Lord Irwin said :

'It is too soon to foretell the lines on which the Statutory Commission will proceed but I have no doubt that this question will be one of those which will claim their most anxious thought. In the meantime, I can

assure you that Government has no intention of making any change in the existing system and I can safely go further by giving you the assurance that no such step will be taken in future without inviting and carefully considering the views of all communities which are likely to be affected. I may, however, take this cpportunity of reminding you that in dealing with the difficult question of Moslem representation the Franchise Committee accepted the course which was at that time generally urged upon it of adhering to the agreement arrived at in the Lucknow Pact—an agreement to which the then leaders of the Muslim community were parties.'

We are indebted to His Excellency for his assurance that Government does not intend to make any change in the existing system to communal representation ·against the express views of the Muslims on the question. But we strongly hope that Lord Irwin's assurance will have the same weight three years hence as it has now and that the Statutory Commission will examine the problem of communal representation in the light of Hindu-Muslim relation existing at the time of its consideration in 1929.

Representation in government services is a matter of much more vital importance than representation in the legislatures, for it is the former by which alone a certain section of a certain people can wield the machinery of the government of their country. It would, therefore, be most relevant for us to examine here His Excellency the Viceroy's observations as regards the representation of the Muslim Community in Government service. His Excellency says :

'In both cases (in all-India as well as provincial services) it has been and is the practice of Government to proceed upon the principle of endeavouring by some reservation of appointments to redress communal inequalities and so to afford to each community an opportunity of taking part in the public service. So far as the central services are concerned, the general practice of the Government of India is to reserve one-third of the vacancies for this purpose.' As a principle, the above is untenable with one reservation which we are shortly to deal. But we straightly ask the Government of India to let us know how far they have put this principle in practice and what is at present the percentage of Mussulmans in the higher and lower cadre of their various services ? On a correct answer of these questions alone depends the practical value that can be attached to the principle enunciated by His Excellency. For ought we know, we have no hesitation in saying that the communal inequalities in the central services have not been redressed so appreciably as to remove the legitimate grievances of the Muslim community. Besides, our exception to the untenability of the above principle is that the reservation of one-third of the vacancies in the central services will not do much good to the Mussulmans, because they are to share the reserved vacancies with other minorities. There will still be two-third of the central services and they will afford to the monopolists of political power enough field to retain their monopoly. We believe that the Central

Government would be better advised if it apportions its posts among the various communities according to their all India numerical strength and fills them up with the most efficient and the best qualified men which each community can give. If this rule is enforced, the Mussulmans will have the legitimate claims to at least one fourth of the total posts under the Government of India. We maintain that no straight way can be found to redress the inequalities between Hindus and Mussulmans in the departments of the central Government. It is, in fact, bare justice that the Mussulmans demand is the same as that of other minorities. Let all right minded men in this country note that if Swaraj is to be the Raj of all Indians, it is essential that the Havenots should be given their due share of what are called light-heartedly 'the loaves and fishes of office' by those who have, in a spirit of gourmandising and without caring in the least for indigestion, eaten them too much. It is time that our political gourmands cared more for their health than for their bellies which are already fully stuffed. If they are true patriots and nationalists as they pose to be, they should remember that the cause of the country is greater than that of the belly.

II

Our Sangathanist contemporary, *The Hindustan Times*, is jubilant over what it calls His Excellency Lord Irwin's 'candid discourses on the question of communal representation' which he made in his reply to the address presented to him by the National Mahommedan Association of Calcutta. The *Hindustan Times* rightly points out that 'His Excellency addressed himself mainly to the vexed question of the times, communal representation, and spoke with candour and frankness rarely excelled by any other Viceroy'. So far as His Excellency the Viceroy's 'candid discourses', 'candour' and 'frankness' go, we ourselves firmly believe that His Excellency's speech deserves for its burden of justice and equity and fairplay the complimentary comments of the *Hindustan Times*, and we heartily wish our Delhi contemporary every honour and joy of humour His Excellency with the above eulogising epithets given to the inimitable way in which he has expressed his views on 'the vexed question of the times'.

The *Hindustan Times* has, however, forgotten His Excellency's 'candour' and 'frankness' with which he has, as we pointed out yesterday in these columns, given a very weighty and memorable assurance to the Mussulmans as regards their claims of communal representation in the legislatures and the government services. It is that assurance which can truly be called a 'candid discourse' and which really abounds with His Excellency's 'candour' and 'frankness'. But it seems that the assurance has proved a bitter pill to the Sangathanist palate of the *Hindustan Times* which has not even referred to it in its comments on His Excellency's reply to the

address of the National Mahommedan Association of Calcutta. The *Hindustan Times* has, however, risen high to the occasion and with great self-complacency coated the bitter pill with the sugar which it has abundantly found in the following passage in His Excellency's speech, Replying to the address of the National Mahommedan Association. His Excellency the Viceroy spoke as follows :

'I have said so much on this subject because I am fully aware of the importance you attach to it, but there are two things which I must add. The first is that it is not possible and it would not be right for the Government, whether Central or Provincial, to prefer communal claims before those of the efficiency of the public service. In other words, whatever the Government may try to do in order to ensure to any community their due opportunity of service, their action is directly governed by the fitness of the community's candidates for the posts they seek to fill. This is why I so warmly welcome the stress you have laid on the importance of education. The other thing I must add is this and I have already said much the same thing by implication. I would most earnestly beg the leaders of all communities to regard these devices of special representation in whatever field as a means to a great end and not as an end in themselves. I have said before, but will repeat to-day, that if their underlying purpose of helping your community better to work for India is ever allowed to be submerged in any narrower loyalty, not only will that purpose itself be brought to nought, but these special safeguards would themselves become a new cause of those unhappy divisions which they were designed to help.'

The *Hindustan Times* has quoted the above extract from His Excellency the Viceroy's speech presumably to show it contains arguments which strengthen the Hindu case against communal representation. The *Hindustan Times* is highly mistaken if it thinks that Mussulmans would take exception to what His Excellency has said in the above quoted passage in his speech against communal claims in government service.

With all the emphasis at our command, we absolutely, perfectly, wholly, entirely and totally agree and if there is any other relevant adverb to qualify 'agree' we would like to use it, one receiving a suggestion thereof from the *Hindustan Times* with all that His Excellency says against communal claims regarding government appointments. But we have to submit to him two things. The first is that Mussulmans never desire that their communal claims should be preferred to the efficiency of the public services. And they do not wish to be meanly selfish and communal in their demands for the simple reason that the Muslim community has already produced and can produce in future such candidates for Government posts who can compete with those of other communities in efficiency and fitness. Can Government believe the fact that the Muslim community has always given its own quota of efficient and fit candidates for enlistment in Government service ? Can Government deny that in the past its own high officials have paid glowing

tributes to the administrative capacity, sense of responsibility, diligence and intelligence of the Aligarians—to quote the instance of the products of the premier Muslim institution in this country. We are really at a loss to understand the rhyme or reason in sermonising the Mussulmans on efficiency. What the Mussulmans desire is that a certain standard of efficiency should be fixed for all government posts and that if the Mussulmans come up to that standard they should be preferred for appointment in those Government departments where their number is not commensurate with their numerical importance. What actually happens in practical life is that where there is no safeguard of a competitive examination or reservation of posts for minorities the Hindu superintendent of an office or the Hindu head of department prefers his own co-religionist because Hinduism is the hall-mark of his efficiency. It is this injustice to the Mussulmans, which is being perpetrated in the high-sounding and deceptive name of 'efficiency', that the Government must destroy root and branch if it wants to allay the growing political discontent among the Mussulmans. The second thing to which we would like to draw the kind attention of His Excellency Lord Irwin is that the Mussulmans do not take the 'devices of special representation' as an end in themselves. The Mussulmans conscientiously believe that they are only a means to attain an end—the end of ending the Hindu monopoly of government posts. When that end is achieved, woe betide those politically imbecile Mussulmans who may desire to walk on the clutches of communal representation.

Source: The Aligarh Mail, December 1926 (Editorial).

33

THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE ON THE NEED OF REVISING THE LUCKNOW PACT

As has been announced in the press the Council of the All-India Muslim League has decided to hold the Eighteenth Annual Session of the League at Delhi, on the 29th, 30th and 31st instant. K. B. Sheikh Abdul Qadir, Bar-at-Law of Lahore has been elected to preside.

The political atmosphere of the country still remains surcharged with potentialities for good or evil, that it is not the time for rest for those who give any thought to the well-being of their country. Muslim India must be on the

alert if the future welfare of Indian Muslims is to be secured with dignity and self-respect. It will be a disaster for us not to take the fullest advantage of our organisation of the Muslim League at the ensuing session at Delhi, where it will be necessary also to elect new office-bearers for the League.

The situation at present is somewhat akin to the situation in 1916 which had resulted in the Congress-League Pact of that year. We are again on the eve of further changes of great political import, changes which required to be watched and shaped properly in the interest of the Muslim Community. There is a call for the revision of the Pact and for the formulation of a practical programme of work among our people to remove their political apathy and rouse their political enthusiasm. This is only possible if Indian Mussulmans will again make proper use of their organisation of the Muslim League, neglect all difference of views amongst themselves, and muster strong at the Delhi Session of the League in order coolly to take counsel together and, concert measures suitable to the occasion, for the advancement of the political status of India, in such a manner as to improve at the same time the lot of our own people, by ensuring that they shall not be deprived of their due share of its benefits and to prepare and induce our people the better to co-operate with other Indians for such advancement. If it fails there is a great danger not only of our being unable to secure a proper solution of the burning questions of the day to our satisfaction as Indians and as Mussulmans, but we run a risk of succumbing to the forces of reaction and even of losing, in some degree at least, the guarantees that the Indian Mussulmans secured after great effort in the last Reforms, as some of our opponents are trying to shake the foundations on which those guarantees were based.

I appeal most earnestly to you as a member of the League, and to all Mussulmans generally for whom the doors of the League are open, to appreciate fully the great importance of the ensuing session at Delhi and to assemble there from all parts of the country in such numbers as to ensure a fully representative gathering and full representative decision on the vital matters that are to engage our attention. I hope it will be realised that to fail in this may be failing in our duty to our people at a time of great crisis.

As is usual, the first day of the Session *i.e.*, the 29th December, will be occupied mainly with the reading of the Presidential address, the presentation of the Secretary's Report and Account and the formation of the Subject Committee and the next two days with the discussion of important resolutions. In the meantime the Council of the League will hold a meeting on the 28th instant at 5–30 p.m. in the office of the Delhi Reception Committee or at such subsequent time and place as may afterward be notified there, to enlist new members and to settle and arrange all necessary preliminaries, including the detailed programme and agenda for the sittings of the League and to frame draft resolutions for the consideration of the Subject Committee, which would probably meet at 2 p.m. on the 29th instant. For this and similar purposes the Council of the League will work and adjourn day after

day till the Annual Session is over.

I hope you will yourself make it convenient to attend the meetings of the League at Delhi and would request you to be good enough to inform the Reception Committee of the probable date and time of your arrival there, at an early date. If something unavoidable is likely to prevent your attendance, I hope you will favour me with your views so that I may place them before the Council for consideration.

Kindly also send me your suggestions with regard to the resolutions that you would like the League to pass at the next Annual Session in order to help in making out draft resolutions for the consideration of the Subject Committee.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, December 1926.

34

SHOULD MUSLIMS ATTEND THE CONGRESS SESSION

As the time of holding the session of the Indian National Congress approaches, the question comes to the fore whether the Muslim community should participate in the deliberation of this so-called national organisation. We have more than once exposed in these columns the true nature of the Congress and have pointed out that the Congress has now ceased to be national. It is now simply a Hindu organisation voicing Hindu sentiments and feelings and domination by Hindu politicians. By attending the Congress, the minority Communities cannot influence the decisions of the Congress in the interests of the nation as a whole because the Hindu majority would not let them to do so. Their presence would only give complexion to the claims that the Congress always speaks for the entire nation. If this claim gains currency and is generally accepted it is likely to prove fatal to the interests of the minority communities in India.

We base this assertion on the fact that almost all the prominent Hindu Congressmen have at one time or other spoken against the system of separate electorates, and, therefore, the probabilities are that if this question comes up before the Congress they would vote for abolishing communal electorates. It is, of course, possible that this question may not be taken up by the Congress but if signs of times mean anything, then it is almost a certainty that it will come up for discussion. Several of the Provincial Political Conferences, which as a matter of fact are branches of the Indian National

Congress have passed resolutions calling upon the parent institution to work for the abolition of communal electorates. Men who helped the Conference to draft and pass these resolutions are the men who guide the destinies of the Congress. It is, therefore, but natural to suppose that they would raise this question in the Congress and have it decided as it has been decided by some of the provincial conferences.

If Mussulmans and other minority communities do not take part in the Congress, its decision will naturally carry the same weight as that of the Hindu Sabha but if they attend the Congress it will be broadcasted far and wide that the decision of the Congress on this vexed question was that of the nation as a whole and not of any one community. With an organized and powerful press at their back, Hindu propagandists will try to convince the world and the British Parliament that all communities in India were sick of communal electorates and, therefore, these should be abolished.

It will be foolish and dangerous on the part of Muslims and other minority communities to put such a good material for propaganda in the hands of Hindu politicians who are adepts in conducting all kinds of propaganda. Let it not be supposed that we are less ardent nationalists than those who are never tired of proclaiming themselves as such. Though we may not make such a show of the matter, still we hold that there is none in India whose ardour and zeal for nationalism is keener than ours. Yet we cannot in the interests of the nation as a whole advise Mussulmans and other minority communities in India to join the Congress for the present. If there is a real change of heart on the part of the Hindus and if they repudiate and condemn the policy of Hindu communalists and dissociate themselves from the activities prejudical to the interest of the minorities, they would again find us most ready to co-operate with them; but until then we should work for the betterment of India in general and the Muslim community in particular in our own way. Our proper place, for the present, is in the Muslim League. We should rally round its banner and consolidate our forces to guard ourselves from the many-sided attacks that are being made upon our community.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, December 1926.

35

EIGHTEENTH SESSION OF THE ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE

Delhi, 29 December 1926

I

ADDRESS OF MUHAMMAD HUSAIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE RECEPTION COMMITTEE

My first duty is to acknowledge the debt of gratitude I owe to the Mussulmans of Delhi, who have entrusted me with the onerous duty of welcoming the All-India Muslim League on their behalf to Delhi of never fading memories and the historic capital of Indo-Muslim culture. I deem it a great honour, but I must frankly admit that, situated as we are today it carries a heavy burden of responsibilities for which broader and stronger shoulders were necessary. Delhi, the cradle and grave of Hindu and Mussulman empires, is now the metropolis of the British Indian Empire where some of the most prominent nationalist and communal leaders of the country assemble from time to time, and it is, therefore, the confluence of all the most important currents of public opinion. It is, in the fitness of things that for the second time in the brief but eventful life of the All-India Muslim League, the premier political organisation of the Indian Mussulmans, Delhi has been chosen for what is going to be a memorable session of League.

HISTORIC SESSION

As in the year 1905, when the League came into existence, India is on the eve of certain political changes to-day which are expected to affect the development of the Indian constitution in a vital manner. So long as India did not make a start on the road to a representative system of Government, the Indian Mussulmans confined their political activity to the removal of what constituted by far the most formidable obstacle in the way of their progress, namely the wrong impression of the British rulers of India that, as their predecessors in office the Indian Muslims formed a storm-centre. To-day when we are at a safe distance of time from the day when considerable section of Indian Mussulmans suffered heavily for what in history is recorded as their 'rebellion' and when other communities of India reaped a veritable harvest of special favours, it is easy for the erstwhile favourites of the British rulers to reproach the Indian Mussulmans for standing aside as a community from political movements right down to 1906. But seriously handicapped as the Indian Mussulmans continued to be after the rising of 1857, no dispasssionate critic can reasonably find fault with the non-political attitude they were compelled to adopt toward what was but the natural expression of the political aspirations of other communities. The League was the first political

organisation of our community, which in the natural course of evolution came into being, after some leeway had been made up, with 'promoting feelings of loyalty to the Government' as the first article of its creed, with a view to keep pace with the political advance foreshadowed by the Minto-Morley regime. In the constitution of 1892 no provision was made for adequate representation of the Indian Mussulmans, who constituted no negligible factor of the Indian population, and it was, therefore, the first aim of the League to secure in the Minto-Morley constitution what was the most obvious moiety of their rights. The Great War brought with it a new outlook, and in 1916, the League acting in hearty cooperation with the Indian National Congress agreed to what is known as the Lucknow Pact, which formed the basis of the Montagu-Chelmsford constitution. This was the second important stage in the political activities of the Indian Mussulmans, and now that we are on the eve of another important change, a reconsideration of our policy and aim must be of historic value to the future development of our community.

A BRIEF SURVEY

As chairman of the Reception Committee it is not within my province to enter into any elaborate discussion of the situation today but I hope the President-elect will forgive me for taking a bird's eye view of it, which I shall venture to describe here within as brief a compass as possible. Since the declared goal of India political progress under British guidance is 'representative self-government', we the Mussulmans of India cannot afford to be indifferent to the place that is going to be assigned to us in the future constitution of the country. Nearly a thousand years ago we struck roots in this soil, and have, ever since, been, are, and mean to remain on the soil. We are as much Indians, and claim as imprescripible a right to remain here and realise our destiny on this soil as any other community big or small may be or may claim. We have in common with others a certain political goal, to which we must travel by a common road abreast of others. Were this fact candidly acknowledged and our rights and privileges recognised in a fair spirit, we would despise all other obstacles in the way of our common march. It is only (a) when we are accused of planning the resolution of Mussalmans rule in India, which we take to be an astute move on the part of interested parties to subject us to the suspicions of the rulers, and concommitant disadvantages, (b) when we are denied our fair share in the Government of the country, as instanced by the contemptuous repudiation of the so-called Bengal Pact by large sections of Hindus, and also glaringly brought out in relief by the mischievous agitation against Sir Fazl-i-Hussain's administration cautiously based on the Lucknow Pact, and above all as is indisputably proved by the amazing attitude of even the Indian National Congress towards both the Lucknow Pact (which has been most carefully precluded from the Congress constitution, disallowing even consequential

amendments regarding the proportion of Muslim representation) and the draft of the Lajpat Rai-Ansari Pact which lies pigeon holed in the archives of the Congress, (c) when we find the hypocratical plea of 'efficiency' raised by Hindu friends—to maintain their monopoly of offices, although while urging the Indianisation of Services, especially the Army they twit the British rulers with the platicudinous maxim 'good government is no substitute for self-government', and argue the efficiency follows experience, and experience is impossible without the opportunity for it, and finally (d) when we find that the majority community is carrying on an intensive campaign for communal organisation in the hope, as expressed by some of the most responsible of Hindu leaders, not to mention Har Dayal, Bhai Parmanand and Savarkar (who have won the hearts of the rising patriots and tinged the communal outlook of such eminent Hindu leaders as Lala Lajpat Rai, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Dr. Moonje and even Mr. Jayakar), of establishing Hindu Raj in India even if the British rulers and the Mussulmans of India combine to prevent such a consummation, and when we are threatened with a deluge of Vedic culture and ultimately complete Hinduisation, it is but only human that we should think of protection against such aggressiveness.

INDIAN AND NOT HINDU OUTLOOK

We are of the Indian soil, and our outlook in life is Indian in essentials; but we refuse to recognise the right of any other community to dominate or over awe us. We must all strive to build up a composite culture, a happy and progressive *Indian* (as contra distinguished from Hindu) nation, which should draw upon what is best in each of the several cultures which have found their way into our country. Just as the Urdu language, the Indo-Muslim architecture and the Indian music are the aesthetic results of a natural compromise, which are now undergoing a further process of suitable modernisation under the inevitable influence of the West; just as our arts and sciences are being enriched by modern discoveries and inventions of the western world, so must the Indian nation grow in harmonious blending of colours and cultures. This way lies the future of our progress. But so long as any one community strives for domination over the other, and dreams of Hindu, Muslim, or purely British Raj, refusing to recognise the right of the other constituents of the Indian continent to develop along their own lines there is little hope for a speedy realisation of our legitimate aspirations as a great country. It is possible for all of us to retain the distinctive features of the various cultures we have inherited in our religious and social spheres without suffering them to come in the way of our political progress, only if we cease to harp back to the past and simply look ahead to the possibilities which a happy combination of our cultural legacies promises us.

NEED FOR SPECIAL PROTECTION OF MUSLIM INTERESTS

The time has yet to come when we, the Mussulmans of India, may be

made to feel by our Hindu compatriots that we have equal rights and privileges with them in the future constitution of India, under which we may enjoys the benefits of self rule without let or hindrance; and it depends entirely on them so to conduct themselves in relation to us as to banish our distrust and inspire us with unshakable confidence in their sense of justice. They can do so by displaying spirit of generous and fair treatment in regard to our claims relating to representation in legislatures and services, which form the real crux of the entire Hindu-Muslim problem in India.

ROUTE FOR SACRIFICIAL ANIMALS AND NOISE AT PRAYER TIME

To my mind raising such questions as 'music before mosque' and the '*route* for sacrificial animals' is in the nature of side-stepping the real issues. The heat and dust raised over such controversies simply tend to befog the larger questions, and side-track the people. But were I to pause to weight the real importance of such futile problems, I should begin by warning the Mussulmans against accepting such labels as 'music before mosques' and 'cows led up for slaughter by certain *routes*'. The real point at issue is 'the intentional disturbance of congregational devotions' or 'noise at prayer time' which no reasonable or fair-minded person will entertain, for a moment. The Government has taken a correct view of the problem in such questions and settled it by an executive order. If any party feels aggrieved by the executive verdict of the Government, since the question is one of civil rights, let the matter be settled in courts of law. It is nothing but defiant and provocative aggressiveness on the part of some over-excited Hindus and Muslims to continue to try the issue by 'direct action' in the hope of intimidating the other party. The insistence of both parties on these questions of *routes* to use the right of way without any restriction is nothing but unwise and irrelevant. Nor am I persuaded tq concede that even noise need be stopped before all mosques when men are not engaged in congregational devotions for which the time is unalterably fixed by religion. The second question arises from rioteus excess generally indulged in by temporarily excited Hindus over cow-killing and taking sacrificial animals by certain common *routes*. There was a time when a concilliatory spirit, characterised the outlook of the people and insistence on unreasonable demands by one party did not provoke insistence on the maintenance of indisputable civil rights by the other, and Indian Mussulmans went to the length of reducing the number of sacrificial kine to a nominal minimum. But unwise zealots of the other party began to claim something like the prohibition of the slaughter of kine by legislation, and actually took some steps in that direction. Had they followed Mahatma Gandhi's advice, and left the question to be determined by the goodwill of the Mussulmans, and not asserted an aggressive attitude the minor issue of 'routes for sacrificial animals' would never have arisen. Where there is a question of give-and-take, the 'giver' must not be made to appear an acting under intimidation, and the 'taker' should acknow-

amendments regarding the proportion of Muslim representation) and the draft of the Lajpat Rai-Ansari Pact which lies pigeon holed in the archives of the Congress, (c) when we find the hypocratical plea of 'efficiency' raised by Hindu friends—to maintain their monopoly of offices, although while urging the Indianisation of Services, especially the Army they twit the British rulers with the platicudinous maxim 'good government is no substitute for self-government', and argue the efficiency follows experience, and experience is impossible without the opportunity for it, and finally (d) when we find that the majority community is carrying on an intensive campaign for communal organisation in the hope, as expressed by some of the most responsible of Hindu leaders, not to mention Har Dayal, Bhai Parmanand and Savarkar (who have won the hearts of the rising patriots and tinged the communal outlook of such eminent Hindu leaders as Lala Lajpat Rai, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Dr. Moonje and even Mr. Jayakar), of establishing Hindu Raj in India even if the British rulers and the Mussulmans of India combine to prevent such a consummation, and when we are threatened with a deluge of Vedic culture and ultimately complete Hinduisation, it is but only human that we should think of protection against such aggressiveness.

INDIAN AND NOT HINDU OUTLOOK

We are of the Indian soil, and our outlook in life is Indian in essentials; but we refuse to recognise the right of any other community to dominate or over awe us. We must all strive to build up a composite culture, a happy and progressive *Indian* (as contra distinguished from Hindu) nation, which should draw upon what is best in each of the several cultures which have found their way into our country. Just as the Urdu language, the Indo-Muslim architecture and the Indian music are the aesthetic results of a natural compromise, which are now undergoing a further process of suitable modernisation under the inevitable influence of the West; just as our arts and sciences are being enriched by modern discoveries and inventions of the western world, so must the Indian nation grow in harmonious blending of colours and cultures. This way lies the future of our progress. But so long as any one community strives for domination over the other, and dreams of Hindu, Muslim, or purely British Raj, refusing to recognise the right of the other constituents of the Indian continent to develop along their own lines there is little hope for a speedy realisation of our legitimate aspirations as a great country. It is possible for all of us to retain the distinctive features of the various cultures we have inherited in our religious and social spheres without suffering them to come in the way of our political progress, only if we cease to harp back to the past and simply look ahead to the possibilities which a happy combination of our cultural legacies promises us.

NEED FOR SPECIAL PROTECTION OF MUSLIM INTERESTS

The time has yet to come when we, the Mussulmans of India, may be

made to feel by our Hindu compatriots that we have equal rights and privileges with them in the future constitution of India, under which we may enjoys the benefits of self rule without let or hindrance; and it depends entirely on them so to conduct themselves in relation to us as to banish our distrust and inspire us with unshakable confidence in their sense of justice. They can do so by displaying spirit of generous and fair treatment in regard to our claims relating to representation in legislatures and services, which form the real crux of the entire Hindu-Muslim problem in India.

ROUTE FOR SACRIFICIAL ANIMALS AND NOISE AT PRAYER TIME

To my mind raising such questions as 'music before mosque' and the '*route* for sacrificial animals' is in the nature of side-stepping the real issues. The heat and dust raised over such controversies simply tend to befog the larger questions, and side-track the people. But were I to pause to weight the real importance of such futile problems, I should begin by warning the Mussulmans against accepting such labels as 'music before mosques' and 'cows led up for slaughter by certain *routes*'. The real point at issue is 'the intentional disturbance of congregational devotions' or 'noise at prayer time' which no reasonable or fair-minded person will entertain, for a moment. The Government has taken a correct view of the problem in such questions and settled it by an executive order. If any party feels aggrieved by the executive verdict of the Government, since the question is one of civil rights, let the matter be settled in courts of law. It is nothing but defiant and provocative aggressiveness on the part of some over-excited Hindus and Muslims to continue to try the issue by 'direct action' in the hope of intimidating the other party. The insistence of both parties on these questions of *routes* to use the right of way without any restriction is nothing but unwise and irrelevant. Nor am I persuaded to concede that even noise need be stopped before all mosques when men are not engaged in congregational devotions for which the time is unalterably fixed by religion. The second question arises from rioteus excess generally indulged in by temporarily excited Hindus over cow-killing and taking sacrificial animals by certain common *routes*. There was a time when a concilliatory spirit, characterised the outlook of the people and insistence on unreasonable demands by one party did not provoke insistence on the maintenance of indisputable civil rights by the other, and Indian Mussulmans went to the length of reducing the number of sacrificial kine to a nominal minimum. But unwise zealots of the other party began to claim something like the prohibition of the slaughter of kine by legislation, and actually took some steps in that direction. Had they followed Mahatma Gandhi's advice, and left the question to be determined by the goodwill of the Mussulmans, and not asserted an aggressive attitude the minor issue of 'routes for sacrificial animals' would never have arisen. Where there is a question of give-and-take, the 'giver' must not be made to appear an acting under intimidation, and the 'taker' should acknow-

ledge the gift-horse in the mouth. Any way, by abandoning the correct attitude suggested by Mahatma Gandhi, and following a course of provocation aggressiveness, the Hindu zealots have themselves postpond the settlement of this issue. Now the question has been reduced to insistance on civil rights, once again the Executive decision of the Government puts the contending parties in a correct position. But I shall once again draw the attention of the Indian Mussulmans to the advisability of maintaining a perfectly calm atmosphere for the exercise of their rights, which must not be tainted by resentment. If obstruction is offered by one party, the other must seek the help of law.

REAL ISSUES : REPRESENTATION AND SERVICES

It is, however, unwise to waste time on such futile squabbles. The real need of the situation is to grapple with the root-cause of the disgraceful manifestations of ill-will, which looms large before our eyes. If India is to be a self-governing dominion of the British Commonwealth, and a representative system of government suited to the genius of the people is our goal, each constituent of the Indian Empire, in federal development or otherwise must know the exact position assigned to it in the future constitution of India. Neither unanimity of purpose, nor prosecution of common object can be possible without it. A clear statement of our demand, based on accepted principles of representation and self-determination must be placed on record for the acceptance of both the Government, and other constituents of the Indian Empire. And once this is done, no confusion of the issues involved should be allowed to deflect our efforts from the pursuit of our aim. With this purpose in view I venture to submit for your consideration what, I feel, may be made a basis for fruitful discussion.

REDISTRIBUTION OF PROVINCES

Having regard to the heterogeneity of races, religions, languages and cultures, and corresponding diversity of economic interests, that constitute the Indian Empire as also the geographical vastness and situation of the Indian continent, it must be recognised that the evaluation of the Indian constitution must proceed along federal lines. Each compact group with common interests, bound by ties of common religion, language and culture (as far as possible and practicable) should be parcelled out into a separate province to determine its own future in harmony with the larger common interests of the entire continent. The present distribution of provinces has a history of haphazard development behind it, and has no rational basis to rest upon. In fact divergent interests have been so grouped together that nothing but futile clash is the result. For instance there is absolutely nothing in common between the provinces of Sindh and Bombay, nor between Hindustani and Punjabi speaking parts of the Punjab, nor yet between Bihar and Orissa. The redistribution of these provinces may appear to be a serious

administrative problem; but the only way to the reduction of friction, and the attainment of smooth working of a federal system is first to secure as much homogeneity in each country (for such provinces are as large, if not larger, as any of the smaller countries of the European continent) as circumstances may permit, and then to give it a suitable constitution which should also be consistent with the larger interests of the entire continent. By separating Sindh from Bombay and Orissa from Bihar, and by creating a new Hindu Jat Province between the Punjab proper and the United Provinces of Oudh and Rohil Khand, embracing the Ambala Division, the Province of Delhi and the Agra and Meerut Divisions, a reasonable proportion of homogeneity of interests may be achieved.

INVASION BUG-BEAR

All provinces must work out their destinies so far as their distinct interests are concerned, and contribute their share of common duty to the Central Government. Our Hindu friends may, obsessed as they unjustifiably are with imaginary invasions from the western frontier look askance at a scheme, and read the preponderance of the Mussulman element in the provinces next the frontier. But they continue to close their eyes to historical facts and deny that never once during the six or seven centuries of Mussulman domination in the north of India, even in those days of open dooks and not the formidable barriers of defence of today, did an invader find the custodians of vested interests a committee for his reception? This bug bear of 'invasion from the frontier' is about the hollowest of all hollow superstitions, and is, as I have said before, the invention of propagandist brains designed for the sole purpose of discrediting the Indian Mussulmans in the eyes of the Government of India, by denouncing them as secret plotters for the restoration of Muslim rule unless the Government of India, be held responsible for it in order to frighten the Hindus. If the Mussulmans are predominant in certain provinces, and are content and happy in their federal state of the Indian commonwealth, does it stand to reason that they would allow somebody else to come and share their loaves and fishes? But if they are denied their due, and threatened with subjection, it is but natural that they should look for a change from which ever direction it may come as even the Hindu revolutionaries are said to have done. If therefore in self-governing India their position is secure, and their legitimate aspirations guaranteed against aggression, there is not the slightest doubt that they would become fighters at the outposts of Indian freedom. In fact, I am inclined to believe that if such a redistribution of provinces is affected, the Mussulmans of India may find it possible to discuss the question of proportionate representation in legislatures and services in a spirit different to that engendered by their present day experiences.

PROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION

This brings me to the question of proportionate representation in legislatures and services, and in the case of the latter the overstressed term 'efficiency'. Inspite of how the Hindu press is interpreting His Excellency the Viceroy's recent pronouncements on the subject of communal representation. I have scanned His Excellency's speeches in vain to find anything that may disturb us. They are usually cautions and statesman-like pronouncements. They are a little too emphatic about the question of efficiency but since no hall mark of efficiency is indicated we may take it that by efficiency is not meant an accumulation of University degrees for some of the most efficient of Indian Muslims, including members of the Viceroy's Executive Council and Judges of High Courts, not to speak of distinguished luminaries at the Bar, have proved the futility of that criterion of efficiency. But when our Hindu friends repeat this shibboleth of efficiency, against the Mussulmans, they forget the cardinal principle of the country's demand for Indianisation of services i.e., 'Good government is no substitute for self-government'. Administrative efficiency is the fruit of experience, and hereditary traditions too, play an important part in fitting a person for administration or military careers. Fortunately the Indian Mussulmans are not without roots in the past in so far as these careers are concerned although as traders they have yet to prove their worth as a community. If 'efficiency' is only a cloak for monopoly our Hindu friends must remember that the argument they advance against the Mussulmans can with greater force, be advanced against them by the monopolists of civil, medical, and military services. It is a double-edged weapon which cuts both ways.

DELHI LESSON IN JOINT ELECTORATE

Regarding the proportionate reservation of seats in legislatures and election by communal electorates, after the bitter experiences of the past, and the recent electorate experience gained in Delhi, the Mussulmans of India would agree to no arrangement which may not guarantee and irreducible minium of representation in legislatures by Mussulmans elected by exclusively Mussulmans constituencies. Lala Lajpat Rai and Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya, the two most outstanding political leaders of Hindus community strained every nerve to defeat Mr.Asaf Ali held to be the fittest of the three candidates for the legislative Assembly, by almost the whole of Delhi, who, was also the nominee of the Indian National Congress in accordance with an unwritten convention by which the seat for Delhi was to be held alternately by a Hindu and a Mussulman. This wanton breach of faith by the most popular and efficient leaders of the Hindu community, and in respect of a Mussulman, than whom a greater admirer and supporter of the Hindus could not easily be found, has driven the last nail in the coffin of joint electorates. Out of 105 electorates of the Assembly only 2, Delhi and Ajmere-Mewara are joint. For the first time since the beginning of the new constitution, we put

the principle of joint election to a test in Delhi by nominating one, the record of whose political work, intellectual equipment for purposes of legislation, and freedom from communal bias was beyond cavil or doubt. But the weight of numbers proved to tempting a proposition even for some of the wisest of Hindu leaders, who did not stop short to measure the consequences of their action and who deliberately withdrew their accredited candidate and appealed to the Hindu electors in the name of Dharma, to defeat a Mussulman. Had they found it possible to appeal in the name of 'efficiency' there might have been some excuse for their action. But so long as members of the majority community have not ceased to talk of 'protection their dharma' against 'minority', and have not furnished positive proof of sustained loyalty to political ideals, by making 'catch phrases and hollow platitude a cloak for self aggrandisement, no Indian Mussulman true to his salt can ever dream of accepting the principle of joint election. Be it far from us to make communal representation as our final goal. It entirely depends on the attitude of the Hindus whether communal and separate representation should be transitory or permanent. If we cling to it more insistently now than before the hostility of the Hindus, alone is responsible for it. On our part we were always afraid that it would stay long because we knew that the Hindus bred and born in tightened compartments of the oldest and worst caste system in the world would not be able to get rid of their communal habits for hundreds of years, even if they earnestly wished it.

But no sane Mussulman feels safe if he is left to the mercy of the rising tide of Hindu aggression; honourable exception apart. Had the majority community held this principle as sacred and sound as we find it described in some of their more sanctimonious and platitudinous pronouncements, they would have brought all the weight of their political influence, if they had any, to bear on these 2 constituencies and secured the election of fit Mussulman candidates from them to demonstrate their own fitness for responsibility. There are but only 27 elected seats allotted to Mussulmans in the assembly of 150 members. To be sure the majority community did not except one or even more Mussulmans, committed to a joint programme, to set the Thames on fire. But their mental narrowness being what they have indisputably proved it to be, it is no fault of the Mussulmans, if they refuse to be left to the capricious mercies of those who entertain dreams of dominating and practically enslaving the minority communities. If they are true to their professions let the Hindu members for Delhi and Ajmere vacate their seats for Mussulmans, these seats having been held by Hindus before and if they show consistent political wisdom of this order for some time despite adverse circumstances there will be time for the Mussulmans to consider how far they can go in the desired direction, I have cited only the most recent and glaring example of this description. Otherwise elections in and by universities and other institutions in which joint election is the rule can furnish a host of flagrant injustice.

LUCKNOW PACT MUST BE REVISED

Then there is the question of adjusting the proportion of Muslim seats in the provinces where they are in a minority. With the redistribution of provinces—in accordance with the principle enunciated above, most of the above difficulties will be removed. But in any case it should not be difficult to find a *modus operandi* with the Lucknow Pact as a basis for discussion. I shall not enter into details; for that privilege is reserved for the League. But a special sub-committee may be appointed to draft a memorandum, of irriducible formulae. The Lucknow Pact though a half way house has been rendered obsolete by the Hindu agitation against it. The Congress has already repudiated it, and no section of Hindu opinion appears to be in its favour. It is but only fair and just that where any community is in an effective majority it shall retain its effective power, and where it is in an ineffectual minority, adequate safeguards should be provided to protect its legitimate interests. If the Hindus are in too small a minority in the N.W.F.P. and Sindh, seats in excess of their proportion should be allotted to them in accordance with a definite scale, which should operate in the same way in respect to Mussulmans where they happen to be in a corresponding position.

PROPORTION IN SERVICES

The actual administration of any government must continue to rest with the permanent services to whom it is given to render the best provisions of law wholly nugatory, if they are so minded. Given the circumstances which compel the Indian Mussulmans to insist on communal representation in legislatures, it is but a logical corollary that constitutional safeguards must be provided against their being crowded out by the predominant element. Precautionary reservation of appointments by Government is one solution of this trouble; but that again is scarcely a dependable factor, the final judgments of actual situation being a matter 'notes put' by subordinates, and individual predilections. But the Mussulmans of to-day shall not be content with anything short of a constitutional provision to secure them a proportionate share of self-government.

TRUE RESPONSIVE CO-OPERATION

This should be the irreducible minimum of our constitutional demand, with any thing less than which we ought not to be content. It should be clearly stated and put before both the Government and our Hindu friends, and it should be the basis of our co-operation with both. To the extent to which both or either may go in this direction both or either may rest assured of our response with unreserved co-operation. We may base our claims neither on imaginary grievances nor on our historic importance; but on the accumulated experiences of daily life. India is on the royal road to self-government, and we claim our legitimate share of it. We grudge no other community, whether non-Brahmins, untouchables, Sikhs, Christians, Parsis

or even Jats and Jains their legitimate demand. When talking of India in a lump as a country, and not a vast continent, we are often misled by drawing analogies from England or any other single European country. Were we to think of India as a continent like Europe, we should easily understand the position of the different communities even as we do in the case of the Spaniard, the Portugues, the Germans, the Italians, the Dutch, the Jugo-slavs, the Poles, the Greeks, the Russians and the Scandinavians. No body finds fault with the separate development of the Jugoslave, although Teutons or Latins may also be among their fellow-subjects; but the demand of the Mussulmans may be condemned by a certain vocal section of Hindu politicians as anomalous, even when they ask for redistribution of provinces to secure homogeneity in certain areas.

FOREIGN AND EXTRA-TERRITORIAL POLITICS

Sir Syed Ahmad, the greatest of Indian Muslim of the last century foresaw the futility and possibly mischief of intermeddling by Indian Muslims with the politics of foreign Muslim powers. We have more than enough to do here on our native soil, and it is but sheer waste of time and energy to devote our attention to problems which are beyond our control. A subject people engaged in a struggle for their own existence can scarcely find time, energy and money to squander on questions which, even when they are most exciting, are beyond their influence. Let us, therefore, devote all our energy, time and money to the organisation of our community and its social reform, so urgently needed, to come abreast of the advancing world. I should be erring on the side of fatuity if I advocated complete aversion of our eyes from the doings in Islamic countries. Our hearts go out to them in their trouble and we feel elated with good tidings from them. And at certain critical moments it does become our duty to do what we can for them; but all this does not mean that we should be so engrossed in what is going on in other countries as to forget the most urgent requirements of our lives here. And very much less reasonable would it be to allow differences of opinion over foreign politics to tear the fabric of our community to pieces, which unfortunately is unwisely being done in India today.

UNITED ACTION

Never was the need for presenting a united front more imperative than it is today. Great political changes are impending and we can ill-afford to pull in different directions. While the different organisations may continue to function in the interests of the specific purpose they may have before them, it is absolutely essential that they should all coalesce with the League to help to formulate the demands of our community to be placed before the Royal Commission of 1929. It would, therefore, be most appropriate for the League to issue an invitation to the Central Khilafat Committee and other organisations claiming representative character for the formation of a

coalition for this puspose. But in any case the League so far from abdicating its position should make up its mind in good time and he provided with something definite against the day of examination. Further, should the Indian National Congress find it worth its while to call a Round Table Conference for the purposes of exploring the possibilities of forging a constitution acceptable to all communities, the League should hold itself in readiness to respond to its invitation. It is unfortunate that the Indian National Congress has raised a wall of amazing prejudices based on sartorial convention and other minor differences of opinion round it, otherwise taking long view of things it could throw its doors open to all sections of political opinion, and form really representative body of invulnerable power. The Congress cannot grow strong by forcing secessions, and by closing its ears to what it is inclined to condemn as the voice of communalism. The wiser course should be to take stock of all the factors of the situation to arrive at a definite result. The League under the guidance of Mr. Mohamed Ali Jinnah, an ardent nationalist, travelled parallel to the Congress so long as the Congress did not turn its back upon the League. In fact the League had virtually begun to function as the Muslim Department of the Congress. The responsibility of refusing the cooperation of the League rests at the door of Congress. It may have succeeded in winning some eminent Mussulman adherents, but in practical politics it is the volume of opinion that counts. And at no time can the Congress claim to speak in the name of entire country, unless it enlists the cooperation of the League, and the representative organisation of other communities. At any rate she should stint no effort to bring about such a consummation. The time has come when the Congress should seriously tackle this question.

STRENGTHENING THE LEAGUE

Finally the Mussulmans of India, who are engaged in discussing 'music before mosque', 'routes for sacrificial cows', *Shudhi*, *Tabligh*, the question of Hedjaz etc., must not forget that the question of all questions is that of their rights in the future constitution of India, which alone will determine the course of their life. Once they are sure of their share in the government of the country, solutions of all other difficulties will easily be found. For this purpose the League deserves the support of all the Mussulmans of India. The creation of a new organisation for every new question that comes up spells the disintegration of our forces. Let us learn to take concerted action, let one organisation grapple with all questions as they arise, let all Mussulmans speak through one representative body. We must seriously consider the mischief that flows from 'hero-worship' which is only another form of idolatory. It is the hankering after hero-worship that is responsible for the multiplication of so many idols in our public life. We must return to the truly Islamic spirit of scrapping the 360 gods to make room for one God of Kaaba. If we are worthy of our past, one political organisation can suffice

for all our needs, provided every so called leader does not go, and build a circle of admirers for himself. There is room enough for all earnest workers and for every kind of earnest efforts in the League. Let all of us lend a helping hand for strengthening the organisation of the League. We must turn it into a veritable citadel of power, which must be garrisoned by every adult Mussulman male of India.

SWAMI SHRADDHANAND'S LOSS

Permit me to detain you for a moment longer, while I give expression to my feeling of grief at the sudden loss of Swami Shraddhanand a very old friend of mine. The dastardly manner in which he was assassinated by a maniac, must excite feelings of abhorrence.

I fear I have intrenched upon the province of the President-elect, and taken up much of your valuable time, and I beg both the President-elect and you to forgive me for it, and also for any shortcomings in the arrangements of the Reception Committee, which has had to labour under no ordinary difficulties owing to a variety of reasons. In the end, I think I shall be failing in my duty, if I do not take this opportunity to pay my thanks (1) to Maulana Abdulla, a prominent Khilafatist, to whose incessant hard work and imagination we owe this mangnificent pandal and arrangements connected there with and (2) to Mr. Muhammed Siddiq, Advocate, and Secretary of the Reception Committee for discharging his onernus duties so well and to the satisfaction of all us.

II

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS[1] DELIVERED BY SHEIKH ABDUL QADIR

I am deeply indebted to you for the great honour you have done in electing me as the President of this important Session of the All-India Muslim League. This is a position which has been occupied by some of the ablest son of India and one may feel a legitimate pride in receiving such a mark of confidence from his community, but there is something in the intricate political situation of the country at present, which makes the weight of this responsibility overwhelming and it is with considerable diffidence that I have ventured to accept this onerous duty. We are passing through a momentous period of our political history and unfortunately the political organisations of our country are more or less in a state of chaos. The National Congress and the Muslim League, which had made up their mind years ago to co-operate, so far as possible, for the advancement of the general interests of the country, have, now drifted very much apart from one another. That is not

[1] Presidential Address delivered at the Session of the All-India Muslim League held at Delhi in 1926 by K. B. Sheikh Abdul Qadir (Printed by the Rifah-i-Am Steam Press, Lahore), pp. 1-29.

all, the Congress itself has been divided into several parties, and the Muslim League has suffered very much by differences of opinion within the community. The recent elections to the Provincial Councils and the Legislative Assembly have divided even the Swarajist Party of the Congress into two hostile camps and the Hindu Mahasabha has tried to oust the Swarajists from the influential position which they occupied a few years ago. This is very distressing spectacle for any one interested in the welfare of the country and the main question before us is to devise means of restoring normal conditions and of enabling various classes and communities in India to stand shoulder to shoulder with one another and to march onward together.

The fact that the All-India Muslim League has been invited this year to hold its annual sittings in this historic town, which is the ancient as well as the present capital of India, is an indication that the Muslims of Delhi, are at last awakening to a sense of their great responsibility with regard to taking their due share in the political life of the country. I spent two very interesting years of my life in Delhi, at an early stage of my career as a lawyer, and had the privilege of coming in contact with some of the best men here and I have since taken a lively interest in the progress of this town. When the seat of the Government of India was transferred to Delhi, I felt, in common with many of its well-wishers, that Delhi was being given a unique chance of regaining its lost importance, but at the same time I felt that the level of intellectual activity here was not then sufficiently high to enable Delhi to take that part in guiding the policy of the country as befits its position, though the Hindus of Delhi were comparatively better prepared than the Muslims for taking part in politics. From the events that have been taking place, since Delhi became the seat of Government, it is clear that the expectations as well as the fears referred to above have been realised. In point of importance and business prosperity Delhi has undoubtedly gained, but its poverty in the sphere of intellectual and political development has been seriously felt as a drawback. Its enhanced status has brought with it new facilities for intellectual progress and it is gratifying to see that Delhi has been given a University of its own, which has begun to function and has made quite a fair start. I am not sure that the Muslims of Delhi, most of whom are now engaged in trade or business, care sufficiently for education and I must take this opportunity of impressing upon them the need of education, not only for the purpose of maintaining their present position in the commercial world, but also for taking their proper place in the domain of politics. Let us hope that the Mahommedan Educational Conference, which has just concluded its sittings in Delhi, under the able guidance of Sir Abdur Rahim, will stimulate education among the Mussulmans of this place and will help to equip them for taking part in political work. No community can properly appreciate political problems without there being sufficiently large number of well-educated men in it, capable of giving a sane and sober lead in politics. The Mussulmans of Delhi should make the fullest use of the opportunities before

them by taking an adquate share in the work of their University, and thereby equip themselves for taking an intelligent interest in politics.

The All-India Muslim League, when it started in 1906, had before it a clear cut policy, which had been decided upon by some of the best thinkers of the Muslim community in India, who combined a desire to safeguard the interests of their community with a patriotic fervour to serve the cause of the country in general. Some of those distinguished leaders have since passed away. I refer to men like the late Nawabs Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Vikar-ul-Mulk. We have still fortunately with us a towering personality like His Highness the Agha Khan, whose wise leadership proved very helpful in the early progress of the League. He was one of the eminent men who conducted the negotiations which finally resulted in the famous *entente* between Hindus and Mussulmans, which is known as the Lucknow Pact of 1916. Owing to the numerous engagements of His Highness out of India, the League has not had, for some years past, that intimate touch with him which it had before. This is regrettable, but let us hope that the League will try to secure once more not only the active interest and powerful support of H. H. the Agha Khan, but will strive to rally round its banner all that is good and great in Muslim India. The policy which had been adopted by the eminent founders of the League was that it should help the political advancement of the country along with preserving the existence of Mussulmans, as one of the most important communities in India. There are many things in the Muslim religion, history and literature of which the Mussulmans feel justly proud and they like to maintain their great heritage at any cost. The Muslim League has been trying to maintain the existing status of the Mussulmans and at the same time to take part in advancing the general interests of the country. The League has supported from its platform many demands made by the Congress, which it recognised as conducive to the common good, but with regard to matters on which there was any conflict of interests between Hindus and Muslims, it advocated the interests of Mussulmans. Whenever any matter was pressed strongly, both by Congress and the League, a favourable impression was at once made on public opinion in this country as well as in England and this united strength proved quite effective. I think if this line of action had been adhered to, both the Congress and the League would have been the better for it and there would have been less friction among the two, than there is to-day. Some of our prominent workers, however, tried to bring about a closer, though somewhat artificial union between the two and began to have the sittings of both at one and the same place and this resulted in weakening the League without strengthening the Congress. It often happened that after the Congress had passed a number of resolutions on the questions of the day and its sittings were over, the League sat to draft a similar set of resolutions and to go through the formality of passing them with a much smaller attendance than the Congress. This reduced the proceedings of the League to a most uninteresting force and for some time it remained nothing

but a feeble echo of the Congress. The Congress itself found it more useful to co-operate with the two new associations which came into existence among the Mussulmans, when the question of preserving the Caliphate in Turkey became acute, namely the Khilafat Committee and the Jamiat-ul-Ulema. The basis of this co-operation, however, was not sound. The Muslims, who were feeling keenly on the Khilafat question, thought that the Congress could help them in saving the Khilafat, while a large number of Hindu politicians, who professed sympathy with that cause, tried to utilise the upheaval of Muslim sentiment for their own purposes, without desiring any lasting or business-like co-operation with Muslims. It was commonly believed that Turkey would not any longer be a Power that would count for anything and Hindu politicians freely expressed their sympathy with what they believed to be a lost cause. But when Turkey merged out of the struggle, in a fairly strong and healthy position, though with its dominions considerably reduced, a change came over their feelings, and their usually hostile attitude towards Muslims, which had been in abeyance under the potent influence of Mahatma Gandhi began to reassert itself. The Mahatma, I think, had a genuine sympathy with Muslim sentiment and firmly believed that no political progress was possible without Hindu-Muslim unity, but a large number of his co-religionists did not share his views and there has been a strong reaction against Mahatma Gandhi's policy. As a consequence of this reaction the *Shuddhi* and the *Sanghatan* movements came into being. The Mahatma tried for some time to stem the rising tide of unhealthy communalism, but so far from succeeding in that effort, he began to lose his popularity and has had to seek a premature retirement from public life. Even those of us who do not agree with all his opinions or his methods of political work cannot but feel that the country is the poorer for the absence of his peace-loving influence from its politics. It is further regrettable that a broad-minded leader, like the late lamented Mr. C.R. Das, has been taken away from us by the cruel hands of death at a time when India stood sorely in need of the services, of men of his type. He too, like Mahatma Gandhi, believed in the necessity of bringing the two great sections of the Indian people together. Thus the work that was carried on by these two high-minded patriots have been interrupted and has been replaced by a counter movement led by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and Lala Lajpat Rai, which is taking up back to a state of things, which we thought, we had permanently left behind. The attitude of hostility to Muslims on the part of the followers of the retrograde policy of the Hindu Sabha, is very short-sighted and harmful to the cause of the country as a whole. It is clear, however, that as long as this attitude continues there cannot be much hope of any real co-operation between Hindus and Muslims. I have every hope that it will not last very long; but as long as it does last, there is only one path open to the Indian Muslims and that is an organised defence of their rights. An organisation like the Muslim League, necessary as it was before, becomes doubly so when it appears to be

essential for the preservation of our legitimate rights. We must take care, however, that any thing in the attitude of the Hindu Sabha towards us should not generate a spirit of narrow-mindedness among us and we should continue to share and support to all the legitimate aspiration of the people of India for attaining *Swaraj*, which has been recognised both by the Congress and the League as the common goal of our national ambitions.

The word *Swaraj* has been shouted from numerous platforms for many years past, since the memorable year 1917, when the Scheme of Reforms was fore-shadowed and more particularly since 1920, when the Reforms were actually introduced. As you are all aware, a school of political thought condemned the Reforms, when they came, as absolutely inadequate and decided to boycott the new Councils. Another school, while practically sharing the views of the former as to the inadequacy of the Reforms, urged that they should be worked for what they were worth. The voice of the latter was, however, over-powered by their more articulate brethren and the results have been rather unfortunate for the country. The two sets of politicians, instead of showing a united front to the bureaucracy, from whose hands they wanted to snatch the greater part of the power hitherto enjoyed by it, began to quarrel among themselves. The extreme wing of the Congress denounced those who wanted to work the Reforms and insisted that we should at once have full autonomy like the other dominions of the British Empire. They were not willing to serve the proposed probation before getting any further steps in autonomy. At the first elections to the newly constituted Councils the boycott appreciably affected the situation. When the second elections came the non-cooperators relaxed their ban to some extent, but insisted that those going to the councils should go there in order to wreck them. This, however, did not succeed and now many of them have come in as Responsivists. My purpose in drawing attention to these three stages of what has been known as the 'Non-cooperation Movement' it to show that in the hopeless endeavour to accelerate the pace of the Reforms, some of our leaders have actually retarded their progress. If the ablest men of the country had from the outset put their heads together and had united to work the Reforms, notwithstanding their inadequacy, the country would have been in a much stronger position to demand self-government. The Royal Commission, which is expected to re-examine the question of Reforms in 1929, may commence its work even earlier, but the spectacle that we would present to the Commission is that of differences and divisions, of struggles and strifes, of internecine quarrels and inter-communal riots and disturbances. I do not wish to blame any particular party or individual for all this, I am afraid we are all to blame, more or less. I have referred to this matter simply to ask all my countrymen to effect some improvement in the existing situation before it is too late. If between 1927 and 1929 we do not behave more reasonably than we have done during the past 6 years, the future appears to be very gloomy. If, however, we spend the next three years in doing constructive, instead of destruc-

tive work, in uniting the various communities in India instead of disuniting them, and in reforming our own social and economic conditions, we will stand a fair chance of getting a substantial advance in our rights and privileges.

The first thing to do for the Congress and the Muslim League, as the two leading political associations of the country, would be to arrange a Round Table Conference of the selected resperesentatives of both, at some central place, as was done in 1916 when the Lucknow Pact was sealed. I have no doubt that the first instalment of Reforms that we got, was materially helped by the agreement that had been arrived at between the two communities. This is evidenced by the fact that the proportions which had been agreed upon at Lucknow, by Hindus and Muslims with mutual consent, were adopted mainly as the basis of decision by those responsible for framing the Montague-Chelmsford Scheme. There has been a feeling since, on both sides, that in certain respects the Lucknow Pact requires revision or modification and if we come together again there should be no difficulty in making any necessary readjustments. It is obvious that a new understanding, or a confirmation of the principles underlying the old understanding with some modifications, would considerably facilitate the introduction of futher Reforms, while without any such *entente* there would be no end of troubles before us. Though it is difficult to anticipate how the Congress will receive such an offer, I feel it to be my duty, as an Indian and as a Mussulman, to express from this platform the readiness of Mussulmans to confirm or renew the Pact, as may be decided after due discussion, and to stretch the hand of fellowship and friendliness towards my Hindu countrymen, in the hope that they will see the advantage of grasping it and negotiating the terms in neighbourly spirit of give and take.

The most important question that will have to be discussed at the Round Table Conference, if it is held, will be that of adequate representation of the Mussulmans in the Assembly and the Councils and other public bodies. The Muslims are in a minority in India and so far as the Legislative Assembly is concerned their representation can scarcely be regarded as adequate or effective. They are also in a minority in most of the provinces of India, where they were given a representation some-what above their proportion in the population, as a result of the understanding arrived at Lucknow. The increased proportion cannot help them to carry out their wishes but creates contentment. There are only three provinces in which the Mussulmans constitute the majority namely Bengal, the Punjab and the N.W.F.P. Of these the last named is still waiting for the introduction of Reforms. Under the Lucknow Pact Bengal got much less than its share, according to the proportion of Muslims in its population and a part of its share and that of the Punjab was taken away to raise the proportion in other provinces, where the non-Muslims were in the majority. There is a strong feeling in the Punjab, and I believe in Bengal as well, that if a readjustment of proportions

is made, the principle adopted should be that the majorities and minorities in every Province, whether they consist of Hindus or Mussulmans, should have equal chances everywhere. If non-Muslim majorities in most Provinces have the chance of an effective control of their affairs there is no reason why the same privilege should not be extended to Provinces where the Muslims dwell in larger numbers. There should, of course, be proper safe-guards to protect the interests of the minorities everywhere, so that there may be as little temptation as possible to the majority to take undue advantage of its numbers or to abuse its powers. I do not think that there can be any honest difference of opinion as to the fairness of this proposition and I think both the communities would really be well advised if they adopt this principle as their guide. There is one difficulty, however, in the way of this readjustment which has to be faced. The Hindus urge, and not unreasonably, that in case there is a revision on the lines suggested above, the increased representation that was given to Provinces in which Mussulmans form a minority, will have to be taken away. I think we must recognise that if an All-India settlement is to be brought about. We cannot justly insist on retaining that increase, when asking for our due proportion in Provinces, where our population is greater. There is now a growing volume of opinion in favour of the view that the small increase in representation which we get in Provinces like Bombay, Madras and the U.P., leaves us very much in a minority still and does not prove of much practical assistance, while it tending to reduce our majorities in Bengal and the Punjab, to the level of minorities. It will be for the Muslims in the minority Provinces to decide whether they are prepared to sacrifice the increase that they got under the Pact of 1916, for the sake of helping their brethren in the majority Provinces and enabling them to take the benefit of their numbers or would prefer the existing state of things to continue in spite of the detrimental effect, it has on large Muslim populations. If they agree to a revision of the existing proportions, it would be to the advantage of the Muslim community as a whole to have them revised. But if they are not prepared to give up the nominal advantage secured by them, then we should make up our minds, in a manly way, to stand by the decision arrived at in 1916 and make the best of our position on the basis of existing circumstances.

While it is generally recognised by all sensible Hindu leaders that Muslims are entitled to a fair representation, the prevailing opinion among them is that such representation should be given through mixed or joint electorates. They say that a certain number of seats in a particular Province may be reserved for Muslims but they may be elected by a joint electorate of Muslims and non-Muslims. It is argued by them that this arrangement would be more conducive to the building up of a common nationality and will have the result of putting in men who will command the confidence of both the communities. I must concede that in theory this proposal appeals to one better than the system of separate electorates of Hindus and Mussulmans, on

which the Mussulmans as a class are so keen. English people who are in sympathy with Indian aspirations also find this view more acceptable and often observe that separate electorates can at best be described as 'a necessary evil'. Their attitude on this point is due to their not being sufficiently acquainted with conditions is India. They judge things by the standard prevailing in England, where for centuries there has existed the idea of a common nationality. That ideal is further cemented by a common language and by a strong tie of common civilization. In India a nation, in the true sense of the term, has yet to spring up and before it does so, we have to solve numerous problems caused by diversity of caste and creeds by differences of religion and culture, and by varieties of dress and food. There are not only several languages, divided into numerous dialects, used in different parts of the country but the votaries of each language and dialect are insisting on the use of their own favoured tongue everywhere and for all purposes. Under such circumstances it is idle to expect abstract theories of the West to apply to the hetrogeneous mass of humanity in India. I can assure Western idealists that the Mussulmans of India yield to none in their desire to assimilate all that is good in Western politics and to introduce truly representative institutions in their country, but as practical men they cannot adopt all Western notions without examining whether they are suitable or not to the peculiar conditions of this country. As regards our Hindu countrymen I cannot understand their prejudice against separate electorates. It has been found by experience that in the conditions prevailing at present, joint electorates very often give only one-sided satisfaction and in some cases give rise to serious quarrels within an electorate. On the other hand, separate electorates have the obvious advantage of avoiding unnecessary bitterness between Hindus and Mussulmans at the time of election and of confining the rivalries of a contest to circles within the community concerned. The Muslims gain no such advantage by separate electorates, which the Hindus cannot share with them. To my mind the best solution of this problem would be that both communities may agree to retain separate electorates till there is a mutual desire to give them up or till any particular local area asks for a joint electorate. I am not one of those, who think that separate electorates will be necessary for all time to come but I am certainly of opinion that they must be retained as long as the present atmosphere of mistrust and suspicion continues and calls for this practical device for preserving peace between various communities. It has become a fashion in some quarters to attribute all our troubles to separate electorates and to describe them as one of the causes of the present tension. There could be nothing more misleading than that and I hope the question will be coolly and dispassionately considered by all well-wishers of the country whether they are Europeans or Indians, officials or non-officials, and a correct judgment will be formed after a close scrutiny of the facts of the case. Some recent utterances of His Excellency the Viceroy have caused some apprehension among Mussulmans as to his attitude towards

separate electorates. I want to take this opportunity of impressing on the Government of India and the Government in England the necessity of recognising that Muslims are firmly convinced of the fact that their interests can be safeguarded in the present circumstances only by continuing separate electorates for them till the time when their Hindu countrymen begin to treat them with such fairness and equity that they may themselves apply for the removal of this and other safeguards which are absolutely necessary in the period of transition through which we are passing.

The discussion of Muslim representation in Councils and other bodies brings me to a consideration of another vexed question, on which the position of Mussulmans is very much misunderstood, sometimes by offcials, sometimes by our Hindu countrymen and very often by both. The Mussulmans claim their proper share in the administration of the country. This is essentially the same demand which the Congress has been making for years on behalf of the people of India as a whole, with reference to their proportion in the higher services as compared with that of European officials. The reply of the bureaucracy to the Indian demand used to be that the larger proportion of Europeans in the higher offices of the State was due not only to any preference on the ground of race or colour, but because of the higher ability and efficiency of the European officials. The Congress challenged the correctness of this view and it is now being recognised that India has no dearth of ability or talent and can supply efficient and capable public servants for every department of service. It is a strange irony of fate that after trying for nearly half a century to establish the capability of Indians, some of our Hindu countrymen even among those professing the Congress creed, should turn round and say that ability is confined to one section among the Indians themselves and that predominance of Hindus in offices of State should continue because the Mussulmans lack ability and efficiency. It is true that there is a much larger number of educated Hindus than Mussulmans and when there is any vacancy in any Government department the number of Hindus applying for it is larger than Mussulmans. The causes of this are obvious. The Hindus are more numerous in the population. They have more men who can afford to get higher education and they have had the advantage of an earlier start so far as Western education is concerned, but in most of our Universities Muslims have shown that, man to man, they are not intellectually inferior to any of their Hindu compatriots and have held their own in competition with them in various subjects of study. Therefore, if the principle of giving them a fair play was frankly recognised, much of the resentment and heart-burning that is to be found to-day and which is one of the most potent causes of friction would vanish. Let the standard of qualifications for a particular position in public service be fixed and let the proportion of Hindus and Mussulmans and members of other communities in particular departments or in a particular Province be also determined according to the requirements of that department or Province, and then let an earnest effort be made to give

each community its due, if it can produce candidates possessing the required qualifications. In judging the relative merits of candidates, regard should be had not only to their position in examinations, which, no doubt, furnishes one valuable test of their capacity, but attention should also be paid to other qualities which are not of lesser value in actual life; for example, character, family traditions and physical fitness.

It may not be out of place in this connection to refer to a commonly prevailing misunderstanding on the question of State service. Some newspapers as well as some politicians try to make out that it is not patriotic to lay any stress on proportionate representation of various classes in the Public Service. It is argued that service cannot give employment even to one per cent of the population and we should look to the interests of the 99 per cent, who earn their livelihood without taking any service under the Government. This argument was once put forward from this very platform some years ago, in this very town, by one of my predecessors. Perhaps he has since had occasion to modify his opinion on this subject, but if he has not, I must say with due deference to him that I beg to differ from this view. The question of employment under the State is not merely a question of loaves and fishes, as is usually observed. It is a question of power and opportunity and of training. The officials in this country have been wielding and, in spite of the changing times, still continue to wield great power, which they can use to the advantage of one party and to the disadvantage of the other, and on such occasions it becomes matter of very vital interest to the communities concerned, whether the persons in power at a particular time or in a particular locality belong to one community or the other. They have opportunities of rendering services to those whom they want to help and if one community has a much larger number of helpers than the other, it makes a difference not only to its present but to its future. Moreover even as a pure question of bread and butter it is not one to be despised or to be treated as affecting a very small portion of people. Very often one individual in India, who is the bread winner of a family, supports a large number of relatives and dependents, and therefore, for every thousand men, who may be in service there are several thousands who are being cared for. The vitality of this question gains still greater force in the case of Mussulmans because some other avenues of work, particularly in the line of trade or commerce are practically beyond the reach of most of them for want of sufficient capital as well as, on account of the greater aptitude of the Hindus for those walks of life acquired by heredity. It is, therefore, necessary that the Government as well as our fellow countrymen may recognise the justness of our demand for a fair share of employment under the State.

Besides the two important matters which have been dealt above, the question of religious differences is one which requires the most careful attention. Instead of being the means of peace and goodwill among men, which every religion professes to be, it has often proved a source of trouble in

the world and India is not the only country which has suffered through religious differences. There have been attempts made from time to time to reconcile the jarring elements of religion in India, but the attempts have often resulted in failure. There have been dreamers among Muslims, who conceive it possible that Islam might become the universal religion of India. There are now dreamers among in some sections of the Hindu community, who think that if they make sufficient efforts they might convert all the followers of Islam in this country to Hinduism and thus create a new nation. But I think it must be frankly recognised on both sides that these two great religions have got to live side by side and cannot destroy one another. The vast majority of Mussulmans love their Faith much too well to give it up for any worldly considerations and similarly the Hindus, with the modern awakening among them and the revived consciousness of the beauties of their own ancient philosophy are not likely religion for any other. The only rational course open to the two parties is mutual toleration and respect for the feelings of one another. Many of our recent troubles would have been avoided, if we had a spirit of toleration. The question of music before the mosques, which has caused so much bitterness of late, furnishes a striking instance of intolerance on both sides. One can understand the excitement of the masses on a question of this nature, but it is difficult to understand leaders of political thought among Hindus insisting that Hindus have a right to play music before mosques, including prayer times, and similarly Muslim leaders saying that a procession with music may not pass before a mosque at any time. Such Hindus should realise that, apart from any question of usage or law, mere decency dictates that if you pass a place of worship you have to pass it reverently, especially when there are people engaged in religious devotion. A European walks on tip-toe, so as to avoid making a noise, if he passes a place where a few people are holding meeting and, for the matter of that, so does the educated India, if he has received the least training in manners. There is no law that enjoins this, but the man who does so, shows his own good breeding and elicits respect from those who witness such a move on his part. The Hindus should, therefore, adopt this spirit and treat a congregation assembled for prayers with at least as much regard as they would pay to meeting assembled to transact worldly business. The Muslims, on the other hand, should learn to abandon, that attitude of tetchiness, which characterises them now-a-days, of smelling an insult even when no insult is meant and of becoming easily provoked. The Sikhs of Delhi set a very admirable example the other day, in this respect, in connection with the procession which they had organised and have earned thereby the thanks of the Muslims here and everywhere. The school of thought that believes that any good can come out of these unseemly squabbles, which arise when one party insists on making the maximum of noise before a place of worship and the other wants to stop it by force, is entirely in the wrong, and the sooner we can get away from the influence of such ill-advised wire-pulling the better it would be for all concerned.

Another problem which has been longer with us than the problem of musical processions, is that of protection of cows. As you all know a large number of Hindus are very sensitive on this point. I am not concerned here with the merits of the question but wish only to point out that if cow-killing cannot be prevented on 364 days of the years it passes one's comprehension why it should be so provoking on the one day when Muslims resort to it, in certain places as a part of religious ceremony. The Hindus may reasonably insist on due precautions being taken to respect their feelings and on avoiding any exposure of the meat or public sacrifice of cows, but there should be no reasonable objection to Muslims performing their ceremony of sacrifice inside their houses and with proper safeguards.

Before I pass on to other subjects, I may pause to mention one more topic connected with Hindu-Muslim relations. It is generally observed by writers in the Hindu Press and by some speakers among them that the Muslims are not sufficiently interested in the affairs of their motherland because of their extra-territorial sympathies with their co-religionists abroad. They go even further and say that a number of Muslims desire to bring the Afghans or any other of the neighbouring Muslim people into India and to introduce Muslim Rule in the country. I do not know a single Mussulman, in any responsible public position, who entertains any such fantastic idea or believes in its possibility. In fact there are many who think that such a possibility would be fraught with danger to the whole country and would adversely affect the interests of all communities residing in it. This theory seems to be the product of the heated brains of a few feddists and is propagated in order to wean Hindus from nationalism and to work upon their fears for party purposes. This tendency should be deprecated with all the emphasis at our command and I hope all sensible Hindus will refuse to be misled by such mischievous propaganda. As to the sympathy of Muslims with the members of their faith in other countries, it is no different in its nature to the sympathy which some Christian nations in Europe show towards other Christian nations in their trouble and is only natural. It does not interfere with the equally natural affection which the Indian Mussulmans have for the land of their birth and which is further strengthened by strong bonds of self-interest. I hope our countrymen will accept our assurance of our devotion to the interests of our country with the same sincerity with which we offer it.

I have dwelt at great length on some practical aspects of inter-communal relations, because I think that it is essential that some way out of our present difficulties may be found. I shall now refer briefly to some other matters of importance, which await consideration. I shall at first take up the forthcoming Commission on Reform. I think it must be recognised by all parties that the Reforms have probably come to stay, whether we like them or not. At the time when they were about to be introduced the bulk of the Mussulmans was apprehensive that the results will not be very much conducive to their

welfare, because they were not as well prepared to work them as were some of the more advanced sections of their fellow countrymen. Experience has shown that the apprehensions were not unfounded and that Muslim interests have suffered even in Provinces where the Muslims were in the majority. The Muslims of Bengal can hardly feel that they are the better for having obtained an enlarged council under the new scheme. The Mussulmans of the Punjab, though commonly believed to have a strong position in their Provincial Council, are not, in reality, any stronger than they were before the Reforms. In fact in some respects their position has been very much weakened. Though the Hindu Press in the Punjab has been endeavouring to make out that they have serious grievances in this Province, yet there is more of skillful and significant propaganda behind that statement than any real or substantial grievance. A change that has been brought about by the new scheme in the Punjab is that the Sikhs have definitely put forward a claim to be regarded a community distinct from the Hindus. I well remember a time when the expression of any such sentiment was objected to by the Hindus of the Punjab and the Government used to be accused of trying to separate the Sikhs from the Hindus in order to weaken the latter. The more advanced among the Sikhs also used to declare that they were one of the many sects that sprung up from Hinduism but this should not mean that they can be detached from the Hindus. This is not less true today than it was before, but the advantage of having separate representation in the council and the prospect of having a more than substantial share in the administration, independently of their numerical proportion, has induced them to set up their new claim. They have found the Government willing to recognise it for its own reasons and the Hindus willing to agree to it for their own purposes, because it virtually adds to the strength of the Hindu position in the Punjab. This has complicated the situation and is affecting vitally the interests of Mussulmans. A strange commentary on the so-called strength of Muslims of the Punjab is furnished by the fact that during the year that is just ending the Punjab has remained without a Muslim Minister, simply because a tried administrator of the capacity of the Hon'ble Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain was chosen by Government as an Executive Councillor in place of Sirdar Sundar Singh of Majitha who had occupied that position for five years. Exception was taken to this by many Muslim Associations and newspapers but their voice remained unheeded. It is further regrettable that in the newly formed Council also the transferred subjects are probably going to be administered without Muslims having a share in that administration. In spite of such disadvantages, however, I think that we cannot but take our chances under the circumstances which now exist, and should work on the hypothesis that it is impossible to go back to pre-reform conditions. We should, therefore, try and prepare ourselves for fighting our battles constitutionally to secure our rights in these Reforms.

I believe that the main responsibility for the losses sustained by us is our

own. We are not sufficiently organised or united, and as long as we allow these sources of weakness to continue, we cannot, expect to hold our own against stronger and better organised communities. We should thoroughly overhaul our organisation and ask the Commission to give us an adequate share of any advance in autonomy. We should also ask for a restoration of our majority strength in Provinces where our numbers are larger than others. We should emphasise the necessity of Reforms being introduced in the N.W.F. Province, which, by the homogeneity of the greater portion of its population, is in a better position than most other Provinces to work the Reforms satisfactorily.

Organisation is not an easy task. Though the All-India Muslim League and some of its Provincial branches have managed to retain their existence, in spite of the adverse circumstances through which they have passed, it must be admitted that most of their branches in districts have been practically defunct. It should be our first duty, on our return to our homes, after the conclusion of this Session of the League, to form active branches of it everywhere. We must raise funds to carry on not only the routine work of the League and its branches, but also to pay the expenses of conducting its propaganda on an extensive scale. No movement can thrive now-a-days without an adequate propaganda to punch it and we cannot afford to neglect this necessary work any longer. After the requisite repairs of the machinery of the League we should turn to the work of co-ordinating the work of some kindred institutions like the *Khilafat*, the *Jamiat* and the *Tanzim*. An All-Parties Conference of public workers among the Muslims was convened at Amritsar in the summer of 1925, through the efforts of our friend Dr. Saif-ud-Din Kitchlew, and it came to a very sensible decision that different associations and the Mussulmans should give up unhealthy rivalries and should help one another, each working in its own particular line to ameliorate the condition of the community. It was understood that the Muslim League should continue to be responsible for organising the Indian Muslims politically, while the *Khilafat* should devote itself mainly to the relations of Indian Mussulmans with their brethren in faith in foreign land. The existing Educational Associations were to remain in charge of educational work, while the *Jamiat* was to concentrate on religious progress. The task of organising the community socially and economically was to be entrusted to the newly constituted *Tanzim* movement. I think it would have been fortunate for the community, if the leaders assembled at Amritsar had, in practice, carried out this decision, but trespassing on the dominions of one another has not ceased and the leaders have allowed their individual ambitions and personal inclinations to over-ride the interests of the community, till things have come to such a pass that the Central *Khilafat* Committee and some of its Provincial branches are estranged from one another. What is still worse is that the workers of the Central *Khilafat* and of its Punjab Branch are abusing one another in the columns of newspapers. There is another extremely regrettable

quarrel going on in Delhi itself between some prominent leaders. I am sure most of us have been grieved to see the abusive writings which this regrettable controversy have produced. Some of the expressions printed in black and white are such that even the man in the street should feel ashamed of uttering them. I appeal to the parties concerned to have some regard for their own position, if not for the morals of the readers of their papers. Each one of them says that he wants to crush the other in public interests but I am afraid that it is the public that will suffer by this fratricidal fight. Perhaps it may be useful if an influential deputation or a largely signed written representation be sent to these gentlemen, on behalf of the community, to request them to stop internal strife and to devote themselves to the cause of the community, which stands in great need of solid work and can ill-afford indulgence in fruitless quarrels. It must be said to the credit of Dr. Kitchlew that ever since he realised the necessity of constructive work and started the *Tanzim* movement he had kept his ideal before him and has not taken any part in the game of mutual destruction that is going on in some quarters. It is a pity, however, that the *Tanzim* has not made the progress that was expected of it, because people are not sufficiently trained to appreciate quiet and solid work and because Dr. Kitchlew has been practically single handed in his efforts. As many of those who were enthusiastic about him when he was advocating the process of revolution left his side when he began to preach evolution. One more movement may be specially noticed and that is the *Tabligh*. It has always existed in theory but it came into activity as a measure of defence when the *Shuddhi* movement gathered strength. It has received plenty of liphomage from Mussulmans but the financial support has not been at all commensurate with the amount of talk that has been indulged in. To this movement I venture to offer a word of advice and that if they wish to convey the message of Islam to the world, they should make it a true message of peace and should try to attract people by laying before them the beauties of their own religion rather than by exposing the real or imaginary weaknesses of others.

Having said something about different movements among the Mussulmans in this country, I may refer in passing to one of the external events that have stirred the Muslim community during the current year. This year has seen the rise in supremacy of His Majesty Amir Ibn Saud in the kingdom of Hedjaz. Ordinarily one should have expected that the Muslims of India would be gratified at any prospect of a settled government in Arabia, which would enable them to perform their pilgrimage with safety and ease, but unfortunately the domes of some sacred tombs were injured by the soldiery of Ibn Saud and this excited the feelings of Muslims in this country. This divided the Muslims of India into two hostile camps, one expressing indignation at the sacrilegious demolition of domes and the other supporting the action of Ibn Saud on religious grounds. This controversy is still raging and the division between the *Hanifis* and *Ahl-i-Hadis* on this point has become

even passed a resolution to this effect in the Congress began to revolt against the adoption of this idea in practice. Similarly the use of *Khaddar* as to which many eminent leaders of the Congress and the Khilafat set an example worthy of imitation, began to lose in popularity, because those wearing *Khaddar* made the mistake of forcing people to adopt its use, instead of persuading them to do so and also made *Khaddar* wearing a sort of cult. At one time a man could hardly be admitted to a political meeting without a *Khaddar* uniform and a *Khaddar* shirt or a *Khaddar* cap became a garb which several hypocrites began to use as 'the white apparel that can cover seventy sins,' as the proverb in India goes. This resulted in weakening the *Khaddar* propaganda instead of strengthening it. But now it is high time that those who believe in the forces of persuasion proving in the long run stronger than the forces of coercion, may come forward and place the popularity of home-made goods in India on a rational and business-like basis. This is the work which the Congress as well as the League and for the matter of that all other public movements in the country may combine to undertake.

Gentlemen, I have taxed your patience very much and am grateful to you for giving me your attention. I do not want to detain you much longer and will sum up what I have said. First of all both the Congress and the League should each put its own house in order and try to bring within their respective fold all the sheep that have gone astray. Then they should both sit together and devise ways and means of acting in harmony wherever possible and of agreeing to differ in a friendly way when such difference becomes inevitable. Having accomplished this they should stand together before the coming Commission on Constitutional Reforms and make a united and vigorous demand for complete Reforms. In the meanwhile, as a preparation for that, they should work hand in hand in spheres of intellectual, economic and industrial progress. If we succeed in doing all this, we shall be proving to the outside world that we are capable of managing our own affairs and achieving that ideal which the late Mr. Gokhale, one of the soundest politicians that India has produced used to express in very simple words by saying that all that Indians desire is that we should be in our country what other nations are in their own.

Before I resume my seat it is my meloncholy duty to refer to the tragic event, which has not only cast its gloom on Delhi but has occasioned great indignation throughout the country. The mean outrage, of which the late Swami Shraddhanand was the victim, deserves to be denounced in the most unmistakable terms by every right-thinking Indian, whether he is a Hindu or Mussulman, and I do so most emphatically on behalf of you all as well as on my own behalf. We have assembled here under the shadow of this serious tragedy which must act as a damper on the spirits of even the optimists among us. The first impression that is made on one's mind by an occurrence like this is that of despondence, but while deeply regretting the dastardly murder of the Swami, I venture to ask all my countrymen and

particularly the members of the Hindu community to control their feelings and to keep the general question of relations between the communities separate from this cowardly deed of a misguided individual. There were many Mussulmans who had differences with Swami Shraddhanand over his religious propaganda, but I am sure they will be as sorry as others to find that a co-religionist of their should take into his head to put an end to his life. The man could not render a greater disservice to Islam or lend a stronger impetus to the Shuddhi propaganda than he has done by this foul deed.

III

RESOLUTIONS
Passed on second day, 30 December 1926

The first three resolutions expressed grief at the demise of Nawab Imadul Mulk Syed Hussain Bilgrami, a Muslim leader, Mr. Khawaja Yousuf Shah, member of the Muslim League, and on the murder of Swami Shraddhanand and the consequent injuries inflicted upon a Muslim who died later on.

4. INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA

Sir Abdur Rahim then moved the fourth resolution which deplored disabilities under which Indians in South Africa were already placed by anti-Indian legislation and regretted the proposal for fresh legislation which if sanctioned by the South African Parliament, would make the position of Indians intolerable in South Africa. The League earnestly hoped that the proceedings of the Round Table Conference now in progress would result in a just and equitable settlement and the establishment of friendly understanding between India and South Africa, removing the cause of the most serious conflict between the two countries.

The mover said that it was inadvisable to utter anything which would tend to strain the relations between Indians and South Africans and thus make the work of the Round Table Conference difficult. Their attempt should be to smooth and pave the way for favourable settlement of the question. He, however, was of opinion that a favourable settlement might be arrived at and the serious and disgraceful disabilities which were imposed upon the Indians in South Africa removed, and no one could deny the justice required that they should have all the rights of citizenship which other South Africans enjoyed. Concluding, Sir Abdur Rahim said, 'We cannot allow our men to be treated as so many primitives.'

Mr. Malik Bakrat Ali supporting the resolution, trusted that the Round Table Conference would find an acceptable solution of the most serious question.

Mr. Syed Habib, said that in the Imperial Conferences it was repeatedly uttered that there was no colour differentiation amongst the inhabitants of the various British Dominions. This was only in theory and not in practice.

Englishmen wanted that the Chinese should allow them to live and trade in China. They wanted this from a foreign country, but they could not vouchsafe the same privilege to a section of the people of their Empire. He was, however, inclined to think that the Round Table Conference could never succeed. If it did not he would demand of the Indians to rise to the occasion by doing some practical work.

The resolution was then put and carried without opposition.

5. MUSLIM REPRESENTATION IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. Mirza Ali moved the next resolution which emphatically declared in necessary that there should be adequate Muslim representation in the Central Provincial Governments in India and demanded that, wherever such representation did not exist at present, the defect should be made good at the earliest possible opportunity. The mover opined that unless Mahommedans were properly represented in the Cabinet of the country and unless they had their proper representation in the higher services, it would not be possible for them to make that advance which was their right to make. He declared with emphasis that Muslim efficiency was second to none. Therefore, if they were given chances to hold higher offices, their efficiency would as a natural course increase.

The resolution was carried amid acclamation.

6. MINISTRY IN THE PUNJAB

Mr. Din Mahommed moved the penultimate resolution which deplored the absence of a Muslim from the Punjab Ministry and registered the necessity of having at least one Muslim Minister in the transferred departments of the Provinces. He explained how, in spite of an adequate number of seats in the Punjab Council being allotted to the Muslims, the Hindus managed along with the Sikhs to form a majority. Thus, it was impossible for the Muslims in the Council to either defeat the Hindus or the Government. Therefore, they were in a very weak position. Thus, it was incumbent upon the Government to safeguard their interests by appointing a Muslim Minister. He alluded to the interests of the Muslims being sacrificed by the outgoing Ministry. In this connection, he instanced the appointment of five non-Muslim Indian medical servants from the Punjab. He recommended that out of the two Ministers one should be a Muslim.

Sir Abdur Rahim said that when as many as 36 men of one community made a unanimous demand that a representative of their community should be in charge of one of the portfolios in the transferred departments it seemed to him that the Local Government would find its hands forced to recognise the demand. The law was sufficiently elastic and the Governor could appoint a Muslim Minister in addition to the two already existing. Then it would be far better as the three communities of the province namely Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims would be represented in the Ministry. He was sure that Sir

Malcolm Hailey would not like the experiment of Bengal being repeated in the Punjab.

Dr. Shafaat Ahmed Khan said that his argument in favour of the appointment of a Muslim Minister was not one of loaves and fishes, but it was that of the restoration of the confidence of a community in the Government. He therefore trusted that no one would object to the resolution which when put was carried unanimously.

7. THE BENGAL DETENUES

The last resolution on this day urging the Government to release the Bengal detenues or to put them under trial without further delay was moved by Mr. Chagla of Bombay. Mr. Chagla said that in England the question of elementary and fundamental rights of the people was regarded as most sacred, yet it was denied in a part of its Empire. There was not a single responsible organisation in the country which had not put forward this demand. In defence of their action, the Government have two reasons. One was that since the detention of these prisoners dacoities in Bengal had disappeared. His reply to this was that the argument was the most dangerous one. The Government could the next time arrest all the leaders to do away with communal strifes and yet put forward the same argument. The next argument was that no one would come forward to give evidence against the detenues. This difficulty existed in other countries, including England; but they had not detained men in this way. British politicians wanted Indians to co-operate but to their dis-appointment they did not find many co-operating with them. The Swaraj Party was not for obstruction. Let the Government either release the detenues or give them a chance for trail.

Mr. Mohammad Yaqub said that there was a large number of high officials in the C.I.D. who got fat salaries from public money but they had not been able to make up a case against these detenues. This showed that all the boast of efficiency to the department was a farce.

The resolution was eventually carried without dissent and the meeting adjourned.

Third Day—31 December 1926

The League reassembled for the third time on the 31 December 1926 in the morning and adopted four resolutions.

8. SANDHURST COMMITTEE'S REPORT

Maulvi Mahomed Yakub moved a resolution urging upon the Government the necessity of publishing the report of the Sandhurst Committee with a view to giving the Legislative Assembly an opportunity to consider it in the Delhi Session and trusting that Government would take early action in the direction of accelerating the Indianisation of the Army.

Mirza Ijaz Hussain of Delhi, in supporting the resolution, said that Mahommedans were more concerned about Indianisation of the Army, because they were more fit for this kind of service. The resolution was carried unanimously.

9. THE STATUTORY COMMISSION

Mr. Malik Barkat Ali of Lahore next moved that the Muslim community should be properly represented on the Statutory Commission when it was appointed. The mover, in a long speech, dealt with the necessity of the appointment of a Muslim who could command confidence of the whole community. The resolution was passed without much discussion.

10. REFORMS FOR N.W.F. PROVINCE

Mr. Abdul Aziz next moved a resolution urging on the Government to introduce reforms in the North-West Frontier Province immediately. The mover said that in the India Office and in England, a wrong notion was spread that the inhabitants of the Province were Afridis. This was entirely wrong. He took an opportunity of explaining to Lord Morley that it was not so. He pointed out that such demand was made by the Muslim League, the Assembly and other organisations more than once; yet the Government had not taken any action. The people of the North-West Frontier Province, he emphasised, were in no way inferior to the inhabitants of any other province. They were on the other hand remarkably superior in physical strength.

Mr. Sayid Kaim Shah, in supporting the resolution, said that the inhabitants of the province, in general, Kashmir in particular, would not be satisfied if the reforms were not introduced forthwith. He maintained that they were not inferior educationally to any other province. The Punjab was not prepared to take them in. Therefore the only course was to fight for Reforms.

Mr. L. K. Hyder said that it was not desirable to amalgamate the province with the Punjab. There must be a frontier province. He referred to the notion amongst certain people that if Reforms were given to the province they would look beyond the Khyber pass. This, he said, was entirely wrong. If ever there was a province in which there was homogenity of language, religion and raçe it was in the North-West Frontier Province. Therefore, from all points of view it was the only province for Reforms. Another argument put forward by the opposition was that the financial position of the province was not sufficient to withstand any foreign invasion. Defence, he said, was a non-provincial question. It was an All-India question and should not be expected to be met from the finance of any particular province.

Sir Abdur Rahim said that as there was unanimity of opinion amongst the Muslims that the Frontier Province should get reforms, he hoped that the Government of India would consider the question carefully.

Malik Barkat Ali of the Punjab and Mirza Ali Mahomed of Bombay voicing the sentiments of their co-religionists in their respective provinces emphasised the necessity of giving reforms to the North-West Frontier Province immediately. The resolution was eventually put to vote and carried.

At this time the League adjourned for lunch, but met again in the afternoon when some important business was transacted.

11. THE REFORMS AND REPRESENTATION

The most important resolution of the session was moved by Mr. M. A. Jinnah as follows :

'That the All-India Muslim League has repeatedly defined its position with regard to real advance in the future constitution of India in its sessions in 1924 and 1925 and reaffirms the resolution passed at its session at Aligarh in December 1925 to the following effect, namely, that whereas the speedy attainment of full responsible Government is one of the declared objects jo the League and it is now generally felt and recognised that the conception of Swaraj should be translated into the realm of practical politics; and whereas it is the declared policy of the British Government also to enable the people of India to take a decisive part in the moulding of their own destinies which is marked by the declaration of August 1917 and the enactment of 1919 which formed a definite epoch in the history of India as a herald of the time when India will possess full autonomy and will rank as an equal with the Dominions and with United Kingdom itself as a members of the British Government.

'The All-India Muslim League is of opinion that the present constitution of India must be amended and urges that for this purpose the Government should undertake a revision of the Government of India Act 1919 and without any delay, appoint a Royal Commission to formulate, after due enquiry and investigation, a scheme so as to place the Indian constitution on a sound and permanent basis with provisions for automatic progress to establish full responsible Government in India and thereby secure stability in the Government and willing co-operation of the people.

'Provided, however, that for any scheme of the future constitution of India, the All-India Muslim League reaffirms and unequivocally declares that the following basic and fundamental principles must be secured and guaranteed namely (1) All Legislatures of the country and other elected bodies be constituted on a definite principle of adequate and effective representation of the minorities in every province without reducing the majority in any province to a minority or to an equality; (2) representation of communal groups shall continue to be by means of separate electorates as at present provided that it shall be open to any community at any time to abandon its separate electorate in favour of a joint electorate; (3) the territorial redistribution that might at any time be necessary shall not in any way affect

the Muslim majority in the Punjab, Bengal, and North-West Frontier Provinces; (4) full religious liberty, that is, liberty of belief, worship, observances, propaganda, association and education, shall be guaranteed to all communities ; (5) no bill or resolution or any part thereof shall be passed in any legislature or in any other elected body of three-fourths of the members of any community if that particular body oppose such a Bill or resolution or part thereof on the ground that it would be injurious to the interests of that community or in the alternative such other method is devised as may be found feasible and practicable to deal with such a case.

'The League hereby appoints a Committee of the following gentlemen as the Central Committee in order to formulate a scheme so far as possible in consultation with a Committee or committees that may be appointed by other political organisations and to report the same to the Council of the League for the consideration of the League and for submission to the Royal Commission when it is appointed. The League also appoints provincial committees with power to add to their number to prepare and define a scheme of future reforms to be submitted to the Central Committee for their consideration.'

(The following are the members of the Central Committee referred to above : Mr. Jinnah, Sir Abdur Rahim, Mr. Abdul Aziz, Sir Mahomed Shafi, Sheikh Abdul Qadir, Maulvi Mahomed Yakub, Sir Ali Imam, Mr. Mahomed Hussain, and Sir Abdul Qasim.)

Mr. Jinnah, in moving the resolution, made a long speech. He said that the resolution laid down as the first proposition that the League desired that the Government of India Act 1919, must be amended and that a definite advance of a democratic character must be made. The Mahommedans were not in agreement with any policy of non-co-operation with the Government nor did they sanction the policy of obstruction or of making the reforms impossible. From the last elections, it was clear that Muslims wished to work the Reforms for what they were worth. They were anxious to see their future position in the country was thoroughly defined and secured.

Reverting to the Lucknow Pact he said that it was not made at their request. The initiative came from the National Congress ; although there were differences of opinion, he thought that the Pact was the finest temporary solution of the difficulties. He then referred to the Congress point of view on the subject of the Mahommedan position in the country and said that it was far from assuring. No responsible Congressman or Hindu leader had come forward with a concrete proposal with regard to the future of the Mahommedan community. Individual pronouncements were, however, made by one person or other; nothing definite was forthcoming. There was no escaping away from the fact, communalism did exist in the country. By mere talk and sentiment it could not be removed. Nationalism could not be created by having a mixed electorate. The history of Canada showed that a separate electorate system did not prove an obstacle in the progress of represen-

tative government. He earnestly appealed to the leaders of the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha to accept the hand of friendship and fellowship of the Mahommedan community, to meet, confer and exchange views in real seriousness to find out a solution. A resolution to the effect which he was moving to-day was sent in 1924 to the Secretaries of the Congress, but no encouraging reply was received by the League. He appealed to the Muslim and Hindu leaders to let the past be forgotten and the hatchet be buried and meet in a spirit of friendship and fellowship for formulating a common demand. 'We desire nothing else but justice and fairness and I assure you that if we the two communities, can settle our differences, it will be more than half work for responsible Government won. But if, unfortunately, there is going to be a failure and it is our misfortune that we cannot come to a settlement, the next course open to the Mahommedans is that we must prepare our case for placing before the Royal Commission and fight the battle.' If the Royal Commission did not satisfy the Mahommedans. they could carry their struggle to the highest tribunal. They would maintain that a principle which was sacred and was a matter of life and death to them must be secured; but he hoped that there was brighter future for the Muslims. He hoped that better minds amongst the Muslims and Hindus will realise that the only course for India was to work in friendship, harmony and co-operation. He hoped that India would rise to that nationhood for which they were aspiring.

A number of speakers then voiced' the same sentiment as that of Mr. Jinnah. Dr. Kitchlew said that once the principle of the resolution was accepted by the Hindus, all mistrust amongst the communities would disappear. On account of their numerical strength, it was for the Hindus to rise to the occasion and by pleasing the Muslims to win their hearts.

Sir Abdur Rahim said that it was impossible to imagine that the Muslim community in India should be satisfied with being relegated to a position of political insignificance under any Government. With regard to the question of the electorate, he said that the principles which were applicable to the conditions in England or other western democratic governments were not applicable to the peculiar conditions in India. In some quarters it was stated that Mahommedans returned to the Council through separate electorate were less patriotic and nationalist in outlook. He instanced the case of Bengal and said that the fear was an erroneous one. Mahommedans in the Councils were as earnest set of workers in the case of political advancement of the country as anybody else. If representative Government was required in the country, it was only essential that separate electorates should be continued. Otherwise the Legislatures would no longer be representative. A government official exercised great influence on the progress of his community. If seventy million Mahommedans were denied a proper share of the administrations, it was not possible for them to protect their interests and to advance their cause. Concluding, the speaker emphasised that it was

the unanimous desire of the community to have adequate representation in the services and have their own electorate.

Source : The Indian Quarterly Register, July–December, Vol. II, 1926.

36

PRESS VERSION OF THE LEAGUE SESSION

I

The *Hindustan Times*, writes : 'Heads I win : tails you lose. Thus alone can the proceedings of the Moslem League *vis-a-vis* the Hindus be aptly summarised.' It is, indeed, a remarkable characteristic of the ingenuity of Hindu communalists that they accuse the Mussulmans of the very evil which is inherent in their own character. We ask the *Hindustan Times* whether it can honestly deny that the Hindus possess both the heads and tails of political power and that they oppose the principle and practice of communal representation in order to lose neither the heads nor the tails. Hindu communalists are adept in the art of tossing political rights and privileges, and their special object in doing so has always been to retain the monopoly of the ostensibly-despised loaves and fishes of office. The Lucknow Pact made in 1919 was also on the part of Hindu communalists nothing but a very clever political tossing. And it is a fact that they did win against the Mussulmans who failed to understand their diplomatic trick. Experience has, however, taught a bitter lesson to the Mussulmans who are now rudely awakened by the political greed of their fellow-countrymen to the inconvenient realities of the situation as it obtains to-day in the country. The Mussulmans, in fact, rue (sic) the day when they entered into the Lucknow Pact with the Hindus. They are smarting under the annoying fact that in provinces where they are in a minority they are in an abject condition, while in Bengal and the Punjab their majority is reduced for all practical purposes to a position which borders on that of a minority. Thus by the Lucknow Pact the Hindus have struck a good bargain because the Mussulmans have lost hold of even the tails of their majority power in the Punjab and Bengal while the Hindus have won the heads of political dominance all over the country. If, therefore, the Mussulmans want to catch hold of the tails of their majority strength in the Punjab and Bengal and in that North-Western Frontier Province which is most unscrupulously denied the benefit of the Reforms, and if further the Mussulmans desire to have effective representation in provinces where they are in a minority without reducing the majority rights of the Hindus the Mussulmans cannot be accused of attempting to win the heads of the Hindus, and to deprive them of their tails.

II

INDIAN DAILY TELEGRAPH ON PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Christmas Week in India is essentially a week of conferences. During the week the Congress has been holding its annual session at Gauhati, while the National Liberal Federation has been holding its session at Akola. Not the least among these annual conferences and political reunions is the session of the All India Muslim League, which is meeting this year at Delhi. This year's session of the League is particularly important in the light of the dastardly murder of Swami Shraddhanand and the consequent increased tension between Hindus and Muslims. We are glad that Khan Bahadur Sheikh Abdul Qadir, has in his presidential address unequivocally condemned the murder of Swamiji by a Muslim fanatic. The address, in this as well as in most other matters, has given a correct lead to the Muslim community. Sheikh Abdul Qadir's presidential address on the whole is a thoughtful performance, in which he has given of his very best to his community and as such his views are entitled to respectful hearing. We could not help wishing for better co-operation between the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League. The President of the Muslim League has every right to resent the League being reduced to a mere echo of the Congress, but the passion for individuality and assertiveness is to be regretted, if it tends to the creation of unhealthy rivalries between the premier national institution of the country, the Congress and a sectional body like the All-India Muslim League.

We are glad that Sheikh Abdul Qadir has given a fair share of attention to the question of affecting *rapprochement* between the two leading political associations of the country. His constructive suggestion for the holding of a Round Table Conference of selected representatives of the Hindu and Muslim communities deserves the support of all leaders of public opinion. The policy of drift in the matter of Hindu-Muslim relationship has been productive of the most tragic results. The interaction of such diametrically opposed forces as the *Shuddhi* and *Sangathan* movements on the one hand and the *Tabligh* movement on the other hand, if allowed free play, will result in the repetition of outrages like the murder of Swami Shraddhanand, contingency which the country cannot afford to look forward to with equanimity. The question of communal representation, the revision of the Lucknow Pact, the advisability of the creation of a few more joint electorates, the question of proportionate representation of the communities in the public services and above all an authoritative and equitable settlement of the vexed questions of music before mosques and cow-slaughter are all problems of the first magnitude, which if allowed to remain unsettled are sure to result in a plentiful harvest of communal troubles. The tendency among leaders has been of late to view the problem of Hindu-Muslim relationship with helpless resignation. The Muslim League President's plea for a Round Table Con-

ference and for the frank discussion of communal disagreement is anemi-nently practical one. Despondency with regard to the chronic tension between the two communities, though to a certain extent justifiable, argues on the whole a lack of faith in the basic common sense of the parties concerned, an assumption which is not entirely warranted by circumstances. A pessimism which will not explore avenues of settlement is scarcely justified at this juncture.

Sheikh Abdul Qadir has also a constructive programme for work inside the Muslim community. He advocates the compartmentalisation of Muslim activities between the various public bodies already working in the field. To the Khilafat he would assign the department of extra-territorial affinities the relations of Indian Muslim with their brethren in faith in foreign lands. .The concentration of all educational work is to remain in the hands of the Muslim Educational Bodies functioning at present, while the *Jamiaat* is to devote itself entirely to the cause of religious progress. The task of organising the community socially and economically is entrusted to the newly constituted *Tanzim*, while the *Tabligh* is to combat the *Shuddhi* and *Sangathan* activities of the Hindus. The political programme of the Muslim League President is satisfactory in the sense, that he visualises the possibility of a united and vigorous demand for complete Reforms before the 1929 Statutory Commission and that he postulates the necessity for a closer union between the Muslim League and the Congress, for ensuring an immediate compliance with the national demand. We sincerely hope that his appeal for unity will bear fruit and result in an increased measure of co-operation between the two leading communities of India, and thus eliminate the need for any foreigner to act as a self-constituted umpire in our fratricidal wranglings.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, January 1927.

37

JINNAH ON THE MUSLIM ATTITUDE

'We desire nothing else but justice and fairness.' This was, the keynote of a speech that Mr. Jinnah made in moving a resolution in the Muslim League Session. This remark very aptly summarises the attitude of the Muslims of India towards the Government as well as the other communities inhabiting India. Muslims as a body are as keenly anxious to get Self-Government for India as any other community but they simply want to see that their future position

in India, in the words of Mr. Jinnah, is thoroughly defined and secured. Mussulmans cannot and will not form any coalition or alliance with any other party, be it the Government or the Hindus, until and unless such an assurance is given to them. All talk about unity between the various communities and all the passionate appeals addressed to them will lead to no tangible result if each one is not assured of a fair and just treatment.

Those who talk most about unity and Swaraj have so far been the last to contribute some concrete suggestion as regards the formulation of a principle that may guarantee a just and fair treatment of Muslims and other minority communities. 'No responsible Congressman or Hindu leader' said Mr. Jinnah 'has come forward with a concrete proposal with regard to the future of the Mahomedan community. Individual pronouncements were, however, made by one person or other but nothing definite was forthcoming. There is no escaping away from the fact that communalism does exist in the country. By mere talk and sentiment it will not be removed. Nationalism cannot be created by having mixed electorates. The history of Canada shows that the separate electorate system does not prove an obstacle in the progress of representative government.' The strong opposition that Hindus are putting up against separate communal representation and the experience that the Muslims have had of mixed electorates naturally makes them suspicious of the motives that the Hindu politicians may have in advocating the abolishment of separate electorates. The more they denounce the communal electorates the greater becomes the apprehensions of the Mussulmans as to the real motive of the Hindus and consequently the greater their insistence upon retaining the present system.

'We desire nothing else, but justice and fairness', continued Mr. Jinnah, 'and I assure you that if we two communities can settle our differences it will be more than half the work for responsible government done. But if unfortunately there is going to be a failure, and it is our misfortune that we cannot come to a settlement, the next course open to the Mahommedans is that we must prepare our own case for placing before the Royal Commission and fight the battle.'

Proceeding further, Mr. Jinnah said that if the Royal Commission did not satisfy the Mahommedans they would carry their struggle to the highest tribunal. They would maintain that the principle which was sacred and was a matter of life and death to them must be secured. But he hoped that there was a brighter future for the Muslims. He hoped that better minds amongst the Muslims and Hindus would realise that the only course for India was to work in friendship, harmony and co-operation. He hoped that India would rise to that nationhood for which they prayed. He earnestly appealed to the leaders of the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha to accept the hand of friendship and fellowship of the Mahommedan community to meet and confer and exchange views in a real seriousness, to find out a solution. A resolution to the effect which he was moving that day, Mr. Jinnah further

added, was sent in 1924 to the Secretaries of the Congress, but no encouraging reply was received by the League. He appealed to Muslim and Hindu leaders to let the past be forgotten and the hatchet be buried and met in a spirit of friendship and fellowship for formulating a common demand.'

We heartily endorse the sentiments expressed by Mr. Jinnah and commend his remarks to the notice of Hindu leaders and others who believe that India cannot progress on the road towards self-government unless unity between the Hindus and the Muslims is achieved. They should ponder over what Mr. Jinnah has said because he has not only voiced his personal views but the views of the Muslim community as a whole and also that of other minority communities.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, January 1927.

38

BARKAT ALI ON MUSLIM REPRESENTATION

The resolution which has been so ably moved by Mr. Jinnah, and which has been so forcefully and eloquently seconded and supported by my friends Dr. Kitchlew and Sir Abdur Rahim, represents, if I may say so, the quintessence, the very soul of the deliberations of the League. In this resolution, as you must have noticed, we lay down certain cardinal principles as the essential bases of any reformed constitution for our country.

First and foremost we lay down that while important minorities are to be guaranteed adequate and effective representation, yet by no manner of manipulation shall any clear majority in the population of any province be reduced to the position of a minority or even that of an equality. This proposition, so obviously fair and just has got to be insisted on, so that the wrong done to the Muslims of Bengal and the Punjab under the Lucknow Pact of 1916 may be righted at the earliest possible opportunity. As you are aware, the Bengalee Muslims are 56 per cent, in the population of their province, and yet their representation in the Provincial Legislative Council has been cut down to 40 per cent. In the same way we in the Punjab are between 55 and 56 per cent of the population, and yet representation that has been accorded to us in the Legislative Council of our province is hardly 50 per cent and is simply on paper. In actual fact and practice, it is hardly 45 per cent. Such a state of obvious injustice should not be permitted to go on for any length of time, and now that there is going to be a revision of

the constitution, we must put forward this grievance in the forefront of our programme. In no event, shall any majority, be it Hindu, Muslim, Christian or any other, be reduced to the status of a minority or even of an equality.

The second important principle that we lay down is that the representation of Muslims in the Legislatures and other public bodies of the country shall continue to b by means of separate electorates, until of course such time that complete confidence between the two communities is established and the Muslims themselves abandon their claim for separate electorates in favour of mixed electorates. Friends, it has become more than necessary to day to state our position in this regard clearly and unflinchingly. For, as you are aware, for the last 2 or 3 years particularly, a most virulent and cleverly organised opposition of the principle of communal representation by means of separate electorates has been contrived by the diehards of the Hindus Sabhas type of politicians, we have recently received a fresh accession of strength to their ranks in the person of such gentlemen as Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya, Lala Lajpat Rai, Mr. Jayakar, Dr. Moonje and others. These gentlemen, calling themselves Nationalists of the purest water, though in the same breath they are leading and organising movements for the conservation and protection of *Hindu interests*, denounce communal representation as the negation of nationalism and say that there can be no peace in India so long as communal representatives continues to stalk in the country. They have even gone so far as to heap on the devoted head of communal representation all rights and all the evils and distempers from which the body politic is suffering to-day. Now this propaganda is mendacity itself. Fortunately one of these gentlemen, no other than Lala Lajpat Rai seems to have abandoned his opposition to communalism, for, I find him blessing it in the course of interview given to the Associated Press and reported in the *Hindustan Times* dated December 28, 1926. This is what Lala Lajpat Rai is reported to have said :

'We may condemn communalism by resolutions and speeches, but communalism of some kind or the other is the very essence of corporate life.' This in the year of grace 1926 from Lala Lajpat Rai should be welcome and one may well congratulate him on the change that seems to have come over the spirit of his dreams in this respect.

Whether Lala Lajpat Rai will continue to adhere to these views is a separate question, but whether he does so or not and whatever the position of his other comrades, we must state our own position clearly and unmincingly.

Communal representation has nothing whatever to do with riots and other political distempers. If it has one certain effect, it is that it eliminates all the factors and forces that make for communal war. The present communal tension is by no means due to it. Communal representation has been in active operation in my own province in the sphere of municipal administra-

tion for the last 40 or 50 years and yet during this long period it has never led to communal riots. In fact when it was introduced, it was introduced as the mixed elections rampant then were a potent and fruitful source of communal discord and strife. Since these mixed elections have been replaced by separate elections, one chief element of perpetual strife has been entirely eradicated. Similarly in the sphere of Council elections separate electorates were introduced for the first time in India in the Constitution of Legislative Councils under the Minto-Morley reforms. Since then up till recently, the movements of the Hindu and Muslim community have been in the direction of peace, mutual goodwill and harmony. If there were any casual connection between communal representation and communal tension, one would certainly have expected communal differences to raise their head in a menacing form soon after 1909, and again in 1916, 1917, 1918 and 1919, after the principle of communal representation had been blessed in the famous Lucknow Pact of 1916. In fact, in the year 1919 we appeared to have reached the very summit of political unity. Thus it is clear that there is really no connection whatever as cause and effect between communal representation and communal tension.

Now it is true, that since the reforms of 1920, Hindu circles have begun to grow anxious and there has been considerable flutter in the ranks of their politicians. This is not because of communal representation but, because the democratic movement on which the reforms were founded, inevitably passed a certain amount of political power and prestige hitherto enjoyed and monopolized by the Hindus, into the hands of the Muslims. Now this passing of power into Muslim hands is the real cause and source of the anxiety and restlessness on the Hindu side. Our friends dare not avow this real cause of their troubles, as they know very well that any such confession would draw down upon them the condemnation of all right thinking persons. But, astute as they are, they are striving to achieve the desire of their heart, namely the retention of the monopoly of political power into the hands of the Hindu community, by concentrating, all the fury of their attack on the principle of communal representation which is the one unfailing means and expedient, whereby the Muslims and other minority communities are reaping the full benefit and advantage of that political power and prestige which the advance of democratic institutions is bound to pass on to them. In a situation like this, therefore, our duty is perfectly clear.

We must stand by communal representation through separate electorates as the one essential condition of our existence in this country, and the more our Hindu friends howl at it, the more must we echo and re-echo it, as our only watch words; the more and more must we proclaim it from the house tops, as it were, our pillar of smoke by day, and of fire by night. (Speech at the All India Muslim League, Annual Session, Dec. 1926).

Source : The Aligarh Mail, January 1927.

39

A PLEA FOR A ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE

The first thing to do for Congress and the Muslim League, as the two leading political associations of the country, would be to arrange a Round Table Conference of the selected representatives of both, at some central place, as was done in 1916, when the Lucknow Pact was sealed. I have no doubt that the first instalment of Reforms that we got was materially helped by the agreement that had been arrived at between the two communities. This is evidenced by the fact that the propositions which had been agreed upon at Lucknow by Hindus and Mussulmans with mutual consent, were adopted as the main basis of decision by those responsible for framing the Montague-Chelmsford Scheme. There has been a feeling since on both sides, that in certain respects the Lucknow Pact requires revision or modification, and if we come together again there should be no difficulty in making any necessary re-adjustments. It is obvious that a new understanding or confirmation of the principles underlying the old understanding with some modifications, would considerably facilitate the introduction of further Reforms, while without any such entente there would be no end of troubles before us. Though it is difficult to anticipate how the Congress will receive such an offer, I feel it to be my duty, as an Indian and as a Mussulman, to express from this platform the readiness of Mussulmans to confirm or renew the Pact, as may be decided after due discussion, and to stretch the hand of fellowship and friendliness towards my Hindu countrymen, in the hope that they will see the advantage of grasping it and negotiating the terms in a neighbourly spirit of give and take.

While it is generally recognised by all sensible Hindu leaders that Muslims are entitled to a fair representation, the prevailing opinion among them is that such representation should be given through mixed or joint electorates. They say that a certain number of seats in a particular Province may be reserved for Muslims but they may be elected by a joint electorate of Muslims and non-Muslims. It is argued by them that this arrangement would be more conductive to the building up of a common nationality and will have the result of putting in men who will command the confidence of both the communities. I must concede that in theory this proposal appeals to one better than the system of separate electorates for Hindus and Mussulmans, on which the Mussulmans as a class are so keen. English people who are in sympathy with Indian aspirations also find this view more acceptable and often observe that separate electorates can at best be described as a necessary evil.' Their attitude on this point is due to their

not being sufficiently acquainted with conditions in India. They judge things by the standard prevailing in England, where for centuries there has existed the ideal of a common nationality. But under existing circumstances it is idle to expect abstract theories of the West to apply to the heterogeneous mass of humanity in India. I can assure Western idealists that the Mussulmans of India yield to none in their desire to assimilate all that is good in Western politics and to introduce truly representative institutions in their country but as practical men they cannot adopt all Western notions without examining whether they are suitable or not to the peculiar conditions of this country. As regards our Hindu countrymen I cannot understand their prejudice against separate electorates. It has been found by experience that in the conditions prevailing at present, joint electorates very often give only one-sided satisfaction and in some cases give rise to serious quarrels within an electorate. On the other hand, separate electorates have the obvious advantage of avoiding unnecessary bitterness between Hindus and Mussulmans at the time of election and of confining the rivalries of a contest to circles within the community concerned. The Muslims gain no such advantage by separate electorates, which the Hindus cannot share with them. To my mind the best solution of this problem would be that both communities may agree to retain separate till there is a mutual desire to give them up or till any particular local area asks for joint electorate.

Some recent utterances of His Excellency the Viceroy have caused some apprehension among Mussulmans as to his attitude towards separate electorate. I want to take this opportunity of impressing on the Government of India and the Government in England the necessity of recognising that Muslims are firmly convinced of the fact that their interests can be safeguarded in the present circumstances only by continuing separate electorates for them till the time when their Hindu countrymen begain to treat them with such fairness and equity that they may themselves apply for the removal of this and other safeguards which are absolutely necessary in the period of transition through which we are passing.

Source : The Indian Review, January 1927.

40

MIXED ELECTORATE AND THE MUSSULMANS

Mahommedans were granted special representation with separate electorate in 1909, but the Hindu leaders have since then been trying that this

concession be taken away and mixed electorate system be introduced, they say that the system of communal electorate is a very serious hindrance to the development of self-governing principle, but in my opinion it is abundantly clear to every politically minded Muslim that the mixed electorate system is fatal to the cause of Muslims and the Mahommedans in India cannot politically prosper without safeguarding of the principle of communal and separate representation, and for Indians so divided by race, religion and caste as to be unable to consider the interest of any but their own section, a system of communal representation is not merely inevitable, but is actually the best.

Uptil October 1926 Haldwani Notified Area Committee had an official president and the members were nominated by the Distrrict Magistrate. The Committee then consisted of five members two of whom (Sub-Divisional Officer and the Tahsildar) were Ex-Officio members while out of the remaining three nominated non-official members two were Hindus and to our entire misfortune there was only one Muslim, in July 1925 a memorial signed both by Hindus and Mahommedans was submitted to the Government requesting that Haldwani should be granted a Municipality and that the Tax payer residents be given the right to elect their representatives with a non-official Chairman. A copy of this memorial was published in *The Leader* of 2nd August 1925, Clause 7th of the memorial is very important so I quote its wordings: 'That the number of Hindu and Mahommedan members at the Board be equal as they are in equal numbers as regard population in the town.' This shows that even the Hindu signatories of the memorial had realised that locally in the interests of both communities it was essential that either there should not be mixed election but a separate electorate be given that at least the number of seats on the Committee be reserved for both Hindus and Muslims. The result of this memorial was that the Government granted the residents of Haldwani the right to elect their representatives as well as non-official Chairman, but somehow or the other the rights of the Muslims were not properly regarded, and perhaps by way of experiment, mixed electorate system was introduced at Haldwani and even at Ramnagar, District Nainital. From the very beginning of these election proceedings all obstacles were placed in the way of Mahommedans; for example before the introduction of this election the boundaries of Haldwani Notified Area Committee were limited to the town itself where out of 7387, the total population, not less than 3,735, or more than 50 per cent are Mahommedans but to override the rights of the Mahommedans of the town Kathgodam and Ranibagh towns some 3 and 4 miles from Haldwani were also included in the Notified Area limits, the result of this inclusion being that the Hindu population increased perhaps by a few hundred. Another example of such obstacles is that 15th of September was fixed for the claims and objections to be made for the inclusion and rejection of any name on the electoral rolls, copies of electoral rolls in the Hindi Characters were duly published and circulated on the 5th of September but the Urdu copies were not avail-

able even at the office till 12th of September, 13th September being a Sunday. Every one knows that Mahommedans are not educated in Hindi and generally they cannot read and write anything written in Hindi characters, it is why, it was provided that Urdu copies be also published and notified. On or about the 11th of September a Mahommedan voter who was also a candidate for the said election sent a letter to the President informing him of these facts and protested against his behaviour, but to no use; consequently the Mahommedans could not have sufficient time to make any considerable claims or objections. I am told that there were certain other hinderances also. Anyhow the election took place and the Committee which is constituted after this election consists of five elected members (Two Mahommedans, Three Hindus) one nominated (who is an European gentleman) and one ex-officio (who is also a Hindu official). After the election the members of the Committee called a meeting to elect their President and one Mahommedan member was elected by a casting vote, but the Commissioner did not approve of this election, held it to be a sham and directed the committee to hold another meeting for the election of the President which resulted in the election of a non-member Hindu gentleman. Thus the result of these proceedings is that only two Mahommedans could secure seats on the committee while there are six non-Muslims including the President. Had there not been mixed electorate, at least half of the seats would surely have been reserved for the Mahommedans

So I would like to draw the attention of the Muslim members of the U.P. Council to all these facts and ask them to do what they can in this direction for the Muslims of Kumaon Division.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, January 1927.

41

A CAMPAIGN OF VILIFICATION

Day before yesterday we published a message from the Associated Press giving an account of a mass meeting of the Mussulmans of Amritsar, presided over by Maulana Daud Ghaznavi and held under the auspices of the Khilafat Committee on January 12 to protest against the provocative attitude adopted by the Sanghatanist Press and public men towards Islam and the Mussulmans since the murder of Swami Shardhanand. The *Aligarh Mail* has already voiced its protest and dissatisfaction against the shortsighted and extremely objectionable policy of those who are exploiting the Delhi tragedy to excite communal ill-will which cannot but result in disturbances of public peace and tranquility. To-day we again condemn the selfish and

mean tactics which these so-called leaders who really ought to have been known as misleaders, are adopting to play the Hindus against the Mussulmans to accomplish ends, which however profitable to them personally, cannot but spell disaster to the interests of India as a whole.

On the murder of Swami Shardhanandji a wave of univeral resentment against the assassin swept over the entire length and breadth of India. Mussulmans, one and all, denounced the deed as cowardly and despicable and sympathised with the Hindus for the great loss which they had suffered. They deplored the tragedy and deplored it more because the assassin unluckily belonged to the Muslim community. It was a psychological moment, and had it been utilised well the Swami's blood would have cemented the bonds of friendship and alliance between the two great communities of the land. Unfortunately, the opportunity was not utilized in the way it ought to have been used by those who in the pursuit of cheap popularity wished to heighten the communal fanaticism of the Hindus. Attempts were made and are being made to prove the existence of a conspiracy, and to implicate as large a number of Mussulmans as possible. But not satisfied with this, most of the Hindu speakers and newspapers started a regular campaign of villification against the Mussulmans and indulged in the most filthy and disgraceful remarks about Islam, its prophet and heroes. This has naturally created a very undesirable atmosphere, which cannot but be deplored by all the true well-wishers of the country. The resolution passed at the meeting held at Amritsar voices the sentiment of the Muslim community when it says, 'The entire responsibility of disturbing public peace and tranquility in India and shattering to pieces the idea of a united nation rests completely upon those vociferous speakers of the Arya Samaj, who indulge in wanton, baseless and disgraceful remarks on the life of the Prophet and present candid teachings of Islam in a filthy language and create an extremely hostile atmosphere against the Mussulmans by the traversity of the Islamic principles and throw out threats to uproot Islam in and outside India.'

The curious fact in connection with this campaign of villification is the attitude adopted by the Government authorities which permits this sort of thing to continue. It is the duty of Government officials to see that every thing that endangers public peace and order is stopped at once. The present campaign which is being conducted in the Sanghatanist Press seriously threatens public tranquility and yet the government takes no steps to prevent it. Some allowance should, of course, be made for the excitement of the Hindus caused by the assassination of the Swami, but that does not mean that even they should be allowed to indulge in activities which cannot but lead to disturbance. We, therefore, earnestly hope that something would be done either by the Government or by Hindu leaders themselves to put a stop to the undesirable and extremely objectionable activities of the fanatics and demagogues amongst the Hindus.

Source : **The Aligarh Mail, January 1927.**

42

THE ALL-INDIA KHILAFAT CONFERENCE
26 February 1927

The annual session of the All-India Khilafat Conference commenced at 11 a.m. in Rifah-i-Am Hall, Lucknow on the 26 February 1927. Considering the All-India character of the meeting attendance was meagre as there were hardly more than 600 people in the hall. Most of the prominent Khilafatists were, however, present. Proceedings commenced with racitations from the 'Quran' followed by the 'ghazal' specially composed for the occasion.

Maulana Abdul Majid Deryabadi, Chairman, Reception Committee, read a very interesting and instructive address welcoming the delegates to the historical place where the Khilafat organisation was first started. Discussing whether the existence of the Khilafat organisation was now needed, he very ably defended its existence, from religious and other aspects. He described the past activities of the organisation and remarked that it was willing to co-operate with all other Muslim bodies for the welfare and progress of Muslims. He exhorted Mussulmans to be up and doing unitedly with full vigour.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

After the reception address, Maulana Shaukat Ali informed that the President-elect being unwell, Maulana Shafi Daudi would temporarily preside. Maulana Abdul Majid Badayuni seconded. Maulana Shafi briefly asked the delegates to enforce the resolutions with full vigour. Mr. Haji Haroon's printed address was then read by Mr. Abdul Rahman, Editor, '*Al-Waheed.*' The address dealt with pan-islamic and Indian activities, appealed to the Mussulmans to be united in the policy about Hedjaz and submit to the correct policy of the Khilafat Committee. About India, the constructive programme greatly stressed economic and social Muslim betterment, and urged Hindu-Muslim unity. While regretting Swami Shraddhanand's murder the address asked Hindus not to blame the whole community for an individual's irresponsible act and appealed to the Hindus to respect the just claims of the Muslims and not to view their efforts to better their condition as antagonistic to non-Muslim interest. Finally, the address asked the Hindus, to respect the Indian Muslim States in the same way as the Muslims respect the integrity and honour of the non-Muslim Indian State. When the Muslims fully sympathise with Nabha and Indore, they expect similar treatment from the Hindus and Sikhs.

After the presidential address was over, the meeting dispersed to meet again on the next day, the 27 February when the Conference was converted

into 'The World Muslim Conference, Indian Branch.'

Maulana Shaukat Ali announced that the president elect, Hakim Ajmal Khan could not come on account of the illness of the Nawab of Rampur and proposed Dr. Ansari of Delhi to occupy the chair. He dwelt at length on the services of Dr. Ansari in this cause and said that he was the most suitable man for presiding over their deliberations.

Dr. Ansari on assuming the chair delivered an extempore speech. Referring to the World Muslim Conference just constituted he said that naturally it might be asked that such an organisation was likely to clash with the Khilafat Committee but a cursory perusal of its aims and objects would assure everyone that it was neither antagonistic nor parallel to Khilafat. The aims and objects of the organisation were to have a common public platform for the Indian Muslims of all shades of opinion and it would have nothing to do with the Indian affairs and would deal with Pan-Islamic matters and try to make a common cause with the Muslims of the whole world. The Khilafat Committee on the other hand was a political organisation of people of definite ideals and such Muslims as were unwilling to join the political organisation should not hesitate to join the 'Motamar'.

Continuing the President said that no doubt they were Muslims but they should not forget that they were Indians first and last and always and as such they should give up communal mentality and bear in mind that communal leaders, be they Messrs. Lajpat Rai and Malaviya or Sir Abdur Rahim or Jinnah, were not friends of India. This communal mentality was responsible for all the bloodshed and riots that had greatly perturbed the national life of the country. He therefore, appealed to them to have nothing to do with communalism but try their utmost to liberate their country.

The President then asked Mr. Shwaid Qureshi to read the draft constitution of 'Motamar' which is the Urdu equivalent of the organisation.

The Conference then effected some minor alterations in the constitution which was read.

The Conference was then adjourned in the afternoon when speeches were delivered and the remaining work of the Khilafat Conference completed.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, Vol. I, 1927.

43

PUNJAB PROVINCIAL MUSLIM LEAGUE

At a general meeting of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League held at Lahore on the 1 May 1927, Sir Mahomed Shafi, President, delivered a long

opening address in the course of which he referred to Mr. Kelkar's presidential address at the Hindu Mahasabha held at Cawnpore in December 1925 and the offers made by him to the Muslim community and said all that the Delhi Conference did in March last was to accept the offer thus made only 15 months previously; but he expressed great disappointment that the Hindu Sabha politicians have now turned a complete somersault, almost immediately after the publication of the statement issued by Mr. Jinnah. The Punjab Hindu Sabha passed a resolution that the Congress had no right to represent the Hindu community in any negotiations with the Muslims and further that any kind of settlement arrived at between leaders of the Muslim League and those of the Congress among whom Mahommedan leaders are included, would in no way be binding on the Hindu community and this in spite of the fact that an overwhelming majority of Muslims present at the Delhi Conference had nothing whatever to do with the Congress organization.

Sir Mahomed then referred to the resolutions adopted at Patna by the Hindu Mahasabha and the opinions of the Hindu press, and said that there was not a single Hindu newspaper whether conducted in English or in any vernacular languages which had accepted the proposition, adopted at the Delhi Muslim Conference. In spite of Mrs. Naidu's effort to draw him out, Mr. Gandhi had refrained from expressing any opinion on the specific proposition adopted at Delhi, indulging merely in vague general platitudes not calculated to give any definite lead to Hindu public opinion. Neither Pandit Nehru nor Mr. Sen Gupta has come out with any declaration one way or the other. Concluding his address, Sir Mahomed Shafi said that until the mentality of the Hindu Mahasabha undergoes the necessary change and that body comes to realise that without Hindu-Muslim unity the attainment of Swaraj for our common motherland is absolute impossibility, and finally until an effective guarantee of the protection of its vital interests is forthcoming, the Muslim community will continue to insist on the retention of separate communal electorates as an integral part of the Indian Constitution. In the existing unfortunate conditions obtaining in this country, the introduction of the joint electorates is certain to prove a periodically recurring cause of friction between the two great communities, fatal to the cause of Indian nationalism and creative of difficult and complicated administrative problems for the Government.

RESOLUTIONS

After the presidential address was over the League held a three hours' discussion and unanimously adopted 4 lengthy resolutions. The first resolution was moved by Sheikh Abdul Kader, noting with regret the scant courtesy shown by the Hindu press and the Hindu Mahasabha towards the Delhi Muslim Conference propositions, exhorting Muslims to close up the ranks, and support the valuable guarantee of their legitimate interests furni-

shed by the right of communal representation in the country's legislatures which they have enjoyed for the last seventeen years and considering it useless for the Muslim minority in this country to formulate any proposals particularly in the face of the irreconcilable attitude adopted by the Hindu Mahasabha.

The second resolution moved by Sir Mahomed Iqbal reiterated the League's conviction that in the existing political condition in the country and provincial legislatures truly representative of Indian peoples and emphatically opined that, so long as an equally effective guarantee of Muslim interests was not forthcoming, the Muslim community could not but continue to insist on the retention of communal electorates as an essential part of the Indian constitution.

The third resolution repudiated the allegation that separate communal electorates were responsible for Hindu-Muslim dissensions and asserted that they were the outcome of the Suddhi and Sangathan movements started by the Hinda Mahasabha.

The fourth and last resolution protested against the pronouncements made by Dr. Moonje at the Hindu Sabha, Calcutta, and at the Hindu Mahasabha at Patna, regarding them as being fatal to the cause of Indian nationalism and warned the Mahasabha to stop Dr. Moonje's activities.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, Vol. I, 1927.

44

THE BENGAL MUSLIM CONFERENCE

Barisal, 8 May 1927

The Bengal Provincial Muslim Conference, held at Barisal on the 8 May 1927, concluded abruptly on account of a rain storm. The Chairman of the Reception Committee, Khan Bahadur Hemayatuddin Ahmed, had read only a portion of his speech welcoming the delegates when it began to rain. The rest of the Khan Bahadur's speech as well as the presidential address was delivered on the next day, the 9th May, the Conference sitting at 8 a.m. instead of in the afternoon.

Sir Abdur Rahim, presiding, began with the Kulkati incident in which several Mahommedans were shot dead by the police. He expressed absolute disappointment at the attitude which the Bengal Government had assumed in this case, but hoped that when the new Governor found time to study the facts relating to the Kulkati occurrence he might try to accept the Muslim

view of it, notwithstanding what his Muslim and Hindu Ministers have advised him. He expressed similar disappointment at the attitude taken up by many Hindu politicians, chiefly among the supporters of the Government. In suggesting remedies, Sir A. Rahim said : 'We have failed to secure an independent enquiry in this important case. The only other means left to us is to seek such remedy as persistent constitutional opposition in the Legislature affords. For that purpose I have sought a clear mandate from my community in North Calcutta constituency whom I more particularly represent and thrown out a challenge to the supporters of the Government to defeat me if they can and thus prove that the Muslim public opinion does not support me. If this constituency gives a verdict in my favour there will be no reasonable excuse left to anyone for doubting what our community wants and if any Muslim member of the Council still hesitates to respect the decision of the Mussulmans of North Calcutta his duty will be to resign his seat and seek re-election. Otherwise, I should be entitled to call upon every Muslim member of the Council to offer constitutional opposition to the present Government until redress is obtained.

After condemning communal propaganda, he referred to music before mosque, stating the general propositions regarding this question. He referred to the local practice and said : If these principles are acted upon by both communities it is possible that even in the present tension of feelings there will be very few collisions; but whatever we may lay down the key of the situation must always remain in the hands of the Executive authorities. If they consult leading men of the two communities whenever they apprehend any trouble and come to a bonafide decision no reasonable man should object to the enforcement of their orders in accordance with the law and in the manner required by the true needs of the situation. The most satisfactory and lasting solution however can only be reached if influential leaders of both communities approach the question in a spirit of give and take and then resolutely exert all their influence to see that the agreed decision be properly carried out.

Regarding the Shuddhi movement, Sir Abdur said : Under the law every believer in a particular religion is entitled to preach its doctrines and to bring within its hold any one who wishes to come in. No Muslim that I know of has ever questioned such right; but I do not understand why such great zeal and energy should be devoted to proving that with the exception of a handful the rest of the Mussulmans in India were originally Hindus. I believe a fair body of opinion is growing in Barisal which demands that these disputes and collisions, which are so entirely alien to the traditions and spirit of the people of this province, should not be allowed to continue to mar the peace and harmony of social life.

Referring to the elections, he discussed both communal and joint electorates. 'On an important question of this character and magnitude no departure should be made from the existing practices except with the approval of

both the parties concerned. That is why Lord Lytton in his farewell address the other day said that this was a matter for arrangement between the two communities. What is very significant is that while Hindu opinion is strongly in support of joint electorates, Muslim opinion, except perhaps of a few individuals, seems to be equally set in the opposite direction. It is my own personal belief that, but for the pronounced anti-Muslim propaganda of a certain class of politicians having considerable position and influence in their community and the unfortunate collisions that are taking place almost daily Muslim opinion would not have been so decided against joint electorates. When mutual trust and confidence have been so largely destroyed, the foundation for co-operation in an electorate is necessarily weakened. The feeling has grown strong among the Mussulmans throughout the length and breadth of the country that if we yield to the demands and threats of those Hindu politicians, who started the movement for a change, Muslim interests will be seriously endangered.

Concluding, Sir Abdur Rahim said that the desire for communal or class or caste nomination must be replaced by a spirit of co-operation and goodwill in advancing the interests of the general population. This is the pivot of the entire policy which I placed before the country in the manifesto of the Bengal Muslim Party. I venture to state on behalf of my community that it is not within the scope of its ambition to dominate other communities. They are sincerely anxious to work in friendly co-operation with the Hindu community in a self-governing India. It is not my belief that it is the desire of the general community to dominate over us; but we cannot ignore the fact that there are distinguished and accredited leaders of a large school of political thought who from time to time express sentiments which add to the anxiety of Mussulmans as to how a Hindu majority may exercise its powers. We are so anxious to advance the political status of our country that we are prepared to settle differences in a friendly conference with the leaders of the other community, however provocative may be the attitude of some of them.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, Vol. I, 1927.

45

DR. MOONJE'S TONE

Who among the Muslims does not know that since his secession from the Swaraj Party and his subsequent preaching of the cult of Tilakite Responsivism Dr. Moonje has not only become a victory of Sangathan and

Shuddhi but has also been brandishing his 'rod' towards the Muslims and has hardly spoken on any occasion on Hindu-Muslim problem without gravely provoking them. The Muslims has become familiar with the 'rod' of Dr. Moonje. They have now to familiarise themselves with Dr. Moonje's 'Lathi' and 'Katar'. The occasion was the Sewa Samiti Conference held the other day at Gujranwala. Dr. Moonje was its President. Considering the fact that Sewa Samities are organisations of social workers whose mission is service and love of humanity, it could naturally be expected that Dr. Moonje would preach these virtues to those assembled in the Conference. Dr. Moonje, however, preached brutal revenge. We regret to note that an indomitable spirit of narrow-minded and petty communalism forced him to excite his hearers against the Muslims. To begin with, the Doctor of Self-defence declared that 'it was absolutely necessary for a Sewa Samiti man to be an adept in the indigenous arts of self-defence, indigenous because the foreign methods could not be available to them, try how much they might'. Emphatically opined the Dr. that 'he who did not know how to wield a lathi was unfit to be a Sewa Samiti man'. We are thus privileged to know that the foremost duty of a Sewa Samiti man, who has been hitherto a social worker, is to wield a political lathi. And for what purpose? Evidently to break the heads of Muslims. For, Dr. Moonje readily declared in a challenging tone.

'We want to live peacefully with the Muslims as brethren but they must also have the same mentality, failing which if they would have a quarrel, we should also be prepared for it.'

We wonder how Dr. Moonje and other Sangathanists can honestly claim to desire for peaceful living with their Muslim neighbours when they possess a mentality which is potent with mischief and provocation which is abundantly in evidence in the above quoted challenge of Dr. Moonje. In his address to the Conference, he regretted that 'among Hindus there was no butcher class'. He also deplored the fact that all the seven crores of Muslims were 'soldiers' and 'burly men' while among the Hindus 'Jains, Buddhas, Vaishyas and Brahmans' were religiously incapable of fighting or taking up any bold attitude. Now, it is no fault of Muslims if there is no class of butchers among the Hindus for it can be easily admitted that even butchers cannot make butchers of others unless the latter give up the worship of animals and lead them to the shambles. Nor can the Muslims be accused for the martial impotency of Jains, Buddhas, Vaishyas and Brahmans or of even Dr. Moonje if he suffers thereby. What the Muslims are concerned with is the 'bold attitude' which Dr. Moonje teaches his co-religionists. The 'bold attitude' imports the onslaught of Sangathan for which Dr. Moonje has singled out the Muslims. And for assuming the bold attitude Dr. Moonje wants even Hindu women to wield the lathi; for he is of opinion that 'the numerically weak Hindus could be doubled for defensive purposes if they trained women also in the art of wielding Lathi and Katar. And

Dr. Moonje brought home to all those who had gathered to listen to him in the Conference that this 'art of wieldings Lathi and Katar was not only necessary in the Punjab and Bengal' but also he wanted it to be practised 'throughout India'. 'This lesson', according to the Militarist of Nagpur, 'was also given by the late Anglo-German War to Europe.' Such then is the war mentality of Dr. Moonje who finds fault with the mentality of the Muslims. Does not Dr. Moonje's mentality carry with it its own condemnation?

Source: The Aligarh Mail, February 1927.

46

DELHI MUSLIM PROPOSALS

Proposals for Hindu-Muslim settlement popularly know nas Delhi Muslim Proposals evolved at a Conference of Muslim leaders of different shades of opinion, held at Delhi under the presidentship of Mr. M. A. Jinnah, 20 March 1927

Whether in the forthcoming revision of the Indian constitution, elections to legislative bodies should be through joint or separate electorates has been the subject of anxious discussion among Hindu and Mussulman leaders in Delhi. The Hindu members of the Congress Party and the Nationalist Party, having already decided in favour of only a joint electorate with the reservation of seats to Mahommedans, either on the basis of the Lucknow Pact or the existing population of each province the Mussulmans met in informal conference to-day under the Presidentship of Mr. Jinnah, who had issued invitations to representative Mussulmans in all parts of India.

After a protracted discussion, the conference agreed to the institution of joint electorates under certain conditions. It was unanimously resolved that the Mahommedans should accept a settlement on the basis of the following, so far as representation in the various legislatures in any future scheme of constitution is concerned:

(1) Sind should be separated from the Bombay Presidency and constituted into a separate province.

(2) Reforms should be introduced in the North-West Frontier Province and in Baluchistan on the same footing as in any other province in India.

If this is agreed to Mussulmans are prepared to accept a joint electorate in all provices so constituted and are further willing to make to Hindu minorities in Sind, Baluchistan and the North-West Frontier Province, the

same concessions that Hindu majorities in other provinces are prepared to make to Muslim minorities.

In the Punjab and Bengal the proportion of representation should be in accordance with population.

In the Central Legislature, Muslim representation shall not be less than one third, and that also by a mixed electorate.

These proposals are subject to ratification by the Muslim organizations concerned, but it was hoped by those present at the conference that the Hindu would accept and the Mussulmans would ratify them.

The question of the services and other questions with regard to safeguards concerning any bill for resolution which might affect the religion, or the customs or the usages of either community, or affecting inter-communal interests were also discussed by the meeting, but postponed for further consideration and will be taken up, if on the main proposition there can be unanimity of opinion.

Source : Jamiluddin Ahmad (ed.), Historic Documents of the Muslim Freedom Movement.

47

HINDU-MUSLIM TENSION
(Sir Mohammad Shafi)

The recent manifestation of inter-communal hatred, resulting in bloodshed and incendiarism, are, beyond doubt, without, any parallel in British Indian history prior to the year 1922. The appalling spectacles, witnessed during the last twelve months, in Rawalpindi, Calcutta, Lahore and other places cannot but have horrified all advocates of ordered progress and shaken the faith of those who have hitherto been inspired with confidence in India's fitness for constitutional progress towards the goal of full responsible Government. When entire communities start running a mock with the result that perfectly innocent Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs are butchered openly in our streets, not because they are themselves responsible for crimes committed in wanton disregard of all human laws, but simply because they happen to profess their respective faiths, it is childish to talk of full responsible Government or Dominion Status for India. In these circumstances, our first and foremost duty is to purge the Indian humanity of the real disease of inter-communal hatred, which has begun to eat into its very vitals, in order to create that atmosphere of unity and co-operation without which the attain-

ment of Swaraj is an absolute impossibility. And the extinction of this devastating epidemic is itself impossible without first diagnosing correctly the causes which have brought it into existence.

An occasion riot between two groups belonging to different communities may have occurred before 1922. But events like that, happening at intervals of many years and in places hundreds of miles distant from each other, due to particular causes, are nothing extra-ordinary, or surprising in a vast sub-continent like India with its multitudinous population of 310 millions. The last communal riot in Lahore took place over 40 years ago, owing to the Muharram and Dusehra having fallen on the same day, resulting in a few shops being looted and a few persons receiving ordinary injuries. But riot after riot in various parts of the country, some of them resulting in casualties the number of which reminds one of the smaller battles fought during the Great War, acts of incendiarism horrible in their consequences, systematic preaching of religious animosity and communal hatred from the pulpit and the platform and abuse of each other's religion and religious heads, such as we have witnessed during the last five years, were absolutely unknown in this country.

Until the year 1906, Indian Mussulmans had on the whole, held themselves aloof from the political stage. During the latter half of that year, distant rumblings in the political atmosphere of coming constitutional reforms gave birth to the All-India Muslim League, founded with the avowed objects of promoting India's constitutional advance, defence of legitimate Muslim interests and promotion of inter-communal co-operation and goodwill. Shortly after, was founded the Punjab Hindu Sabha with similar non-aggressive and legitimate ends. And right until the end of 1920, the activities of these two bodies, while bringing about awakening among the two communities, did not have any baneful effect on that inter-communal co-operation and goodwill, which was a pleasing feature of the situation in those days. Indeed towards the end of 1916 the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League came to a settlement regarding Muslim representation in the various Indian Legislatures and other important problems which, inspite of its defects, was largely instrumental in promoting the cause of constitutional advance in India, some of its principal features being embodied in the Chelmsford-Montague Reforms introduced towards the beginning of 1921. The unfortunate happenings in the Punjab and the consequent declaration of Martial Law in April 1919 proved a powerful agency in bringing the two great communities closer together and, in the following year, the over-stringent Turkish Peace Terms, embodied in the Treaty of Severes, had their repercussions in India which strengthened the bonds of Hindu-Muslim unity to an extent hitherto unknown in this country. This remarkable inter-communal unity was the most pleasing feature of the Indian political situation during the three eventful years from 1919 till the end of 1921.

But in the wide-spread agitation carried on against the Government in

all parts of the country under the leadership of Mr. Gandhi during that very period, the 'nationalist' leaders committed a blunder which, to my mind, is the initial cause of the aftermath which we are facing at the present moment. It will be remembered that the various boycotts decided upon in the Special Session of the Congress, held in Calcutta during the month of September 1920, failed in their accomplishment among the Indian intelligentsia. Albeit, they were, in the conditions even then prevailing in this vast continent, fore-doomed to failure. The leaders of the Non-Cooperation movement thereupon turned their attention to the vast masses of India for the success of their movement. And in order to influence the masses in the direction aimed at, they considered it essential to bring into requisition the powerful agencies of Hindu and Muslim religious circles, Swamies and Maulanas were let loose from their cloisters all over the country and, for the first time in the history of British India, religion was introduced actively into the field of politics. And, finally, when the Non-Cooperation movement failed absolutely, it became, as it was bound to do, a case of *main to kambal ko chhorta hun magar kambal mujhe nahin chhorta.* The forces thus let loose have ultimately recoiled on our own heads, producing results which far-sighted statesmanship ought then to have foreseen.

Meanwhile, the new constitutional machinery set up under the Government of India Act, 1919, started working in the beginning of 1921. While the Non-Cooperators absolutely boycotted the reformed Legislatures, the Moderates decided to work the Reforms in order to lay the foundation for India's claim to full Responsible Government, as promised by Parliament in the solemn declaration embodied in the preamble to that Act. Lord Chelmsford was himself one of the two engineers who had invented and built up that machinery and Lord Reading was sent out to India with a mandate not only from the British Parliament but also from His Majesty the King Emperor himself to devote his great knowledge and experience to its successful working. And the successful working of the reformed Councils as well as a revision, on reasonable lines, of the Turkish Peace Terms were necessary also to counteract the Non-Cooperation movement. The Government and the Moderates within the various Indian Legislatures, Central and Provincial, therefore, co-operated whole-heartedly, during the year 1921, in demonstrating the possibilities of, as well as the power possessed by our Legislatures under the new Constitution. By the end of that year, those who had been watching the new situation with unbiassed minds as well as those who had taken an active part in the successful working of the reformed machinery were, in their heart of hearts, convinced that the foundations of democratic Government in India had been well and truly laid, that real power was coming into the hands of the elected representatives of the people and that, the solemn pledge embodied in the preamble to the Act of 1919 being beyond recall, the issue, in regard to the question of Indian Self-Government was now merely one of time. Oriental temperament is, by nature, both imaginative

and speculative. Certain Hindu circles began to ask themselves, 'what will happen when full Responsible Government is granted to India ? Democratic Government being, in principle, synonymous with the rule of majority, steps must at once be taken so that when the time arrives the majority may be so overwhelming as to secure the permanent establishment of its rule over Hindustan. And in order to prevent any possibility of a combination of the minority in India and a certain power from across the borders becoming a danger to the majority, its physical regeneration must at once be taken in hand so that when the time arrives the vast millions in India may be in a position to resist successfully the combination alluded to above. Hence the Shudhi and Sangathan movements were started early in 1922. The Muslim minority, on the other hand, began to ask itself what will its position be when India is granted full Responsible Government ? The results of past struggle between the 'Haves' and the 'Have-nots' had already filled their minds with grave misgivings regarding their own future in a self-governing India and the the new movements started in the majority camp filled them with positive alarm. The result was the organisation of Tabligh and Tanzim movements in order to counter the activities of the majority. The Chelmsford-Montague Reforms were thus, in a sense, responsible for the unhappy conditions which began to develop in this unfortunate country and in reality mutual distrust lay at the root of the new development. Even Lala Lajpat Rai admitted our present communal troubles to be 'political and economic in their origin'.

The situation described in the preceding paragraph was further complicated by that increasing craze for leadership which has been the bane of our country during the last few years. Non-violent Non-Cooperation may possibly be a practical conception when adopted by a comparatively small community, such as the Indians in South Africa, bound together by identity of interests. But in a heterogeneous mass of 310 millions of population spread over a vast sub-continent like India, even the intelligentsia among whom were divided into various schools of political thought—with its perplexing diversity of languages, creeds, social codes and material interests—such a movement was as observed above, foredoomed to failure Indeed, in a country like India where the major portion of the population were wallowing in the mire of utter ignorance, it could not long remain even non-violent. On the top of it came the colossal blunder of boycotting His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales visit with the resulting disturbances in different parts of the country. In March 1922, Mr. Gandhi was incarcerated and with his arrest and subsequent conviction the one magnetic personality which had held these really militant elements together in a non-violent movement was removed from the Indian Political Stage. It is a fact furnishing an interesting though painful subject for psychological research that Mr. Gandhi's removal from the political stage synchronized with the foundation of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, the commencement of Shudhi and Sangathan movements and the fight for leadership which followed in their make. An examination of the

correlation of these three phenomena, however interesting, is boyond the scope of this article. In the fight for leadership of new movements, it is natural for those taking a leading part therein to vie with each other in drawing word pictures calculated to appeal to the sentiments, and alas; sometime even to the passions of those whom they seek to bring within their sphere of influence. The application of this undesirable proposition is not confined to one community but extends to all alike.

Had Shudhi and Tabligh movements their origin merely in honest religious zeal, had they been started with the patriotic object of uplifting the vast heterogeneous mass of our population known as the depressed classes, resulting in the latter's unostentatious and peaceful absorption among the Hindu and Muslim communities, it would all have been to the good of the country as a whole. But conceived in an aggressive spirit and with the ultimate political end already described, this clash of political forces masquerading in a religious garb could not but produce results too horrible to contemplate. Thousands of Hindu and Muslim missionaries spread about the country attacking each other's religion, countless pamphlets defaming great religious heads held in veneration by their followers and disgraceful literature in the Vernacular Press inflaming baser religious passions absolutely poisoned the Indian atmosphere, creating an unhappy state of things unparalleled in the past history of British India. And the law of the land was apparently powerless to prevent the spread of this deadly poison. For when the writer of a despicable-and scurrilous pamphlet such as the 'Rungila Rasul' can go unpunished on the ground that its publication does not fall within the purview of section 153 A of the Indian Penal Code, what hope is there of the Courts stepping in to check the advance of a poisonous gangrene which is destroying the beautiful fruit of religious toleration in a country hitherto famous as a peaceful home of all religions ?

Had a joint scheme of Indian Sanghathan been started for the physical regeneration of the Indian peoples in order to prepare them for the defence of their common motherland when Swaraj is granted to this country, the benefits arising out of such a patriotic movement would have been incalculable. But the Sangathan movement started by the Hindu Mahasabha was in its very conception anti-Muslim and the speeches delivered in its support during the last five years from hundreds of platforms in all parts of the country, couched in language of politico-religious fervour, could not but create a similar counter-movement among the Mussulmans. And, strange to say, our foremost leaders, who in the past were stalwart advocates of Indian Nationalism, have been the worst sinners in this respect.

At the very first Anniversary of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha held at Gaya on 30 December 1922, Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviya, during the course of his presidential address, observed : 'What was the Hindu Dharma ? It told them to respect other religions, to be tolerant and never to be aggressive. But it also enjoined upon them not to hesitate for a moment

to lay down even their lives, if their Dharma was attacked. In the observance of this Dharma alone to its very letter and spirit lay the true solution of Hindu-Muslim Unity. He was convinced that no unity could be maintained unless both the Hindus and Mussulmans individually felt strong enough to defend themselves against attacks by bad elements of the other. He did not say this in order to prepare the Hindus for aggressive ends, but to remove the only cause of conflict. The breaches in the past were due mainly to the weakness of the Hindus. Bad elements among the Mahommedans, feeling sure that the Hindus were cowards, attacked them. After working for a long time in the service of the public, he had come to only one conclusion on the question of Hindu-Muslim Unity. It was that each should feel that the other was strong enough to ward off successfully any unjust attack by the other and thus alone harmony be maintained—'Shorn of mere platitudes and camouflage, this is exactly the doctrine which used to be preached by the leaders of the two European concerts during the quarter of a century preceding the Great War, *i.e.*, 'preparation for war is a sure guarantee of peace' a doctrine which inevitably led to the world-conflict of 1914–1918, destroying the manhood of nations, devastating some of the richest and most beautiful lands on God's earth and bringing incalculable misery and suffering to millions of homes in all parts of the world. And it is strange that this pronouncement should have been made at a time, when, as has been shown above, inter-communal co-operation and goodwill was the most pleasing feature of the Indian political situation.

And at the next anniversary, held at Benares, on 19 August 1923, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya indulged in plainer and yet stronger language. He reminded the Hindu community of the 'inhuman, brutal and unparalleled atrocities' which, according to him, 'were perpetrated on Hindus' in 1916 in Eastern Bengal. 'Hindu Women,' said he, 'were outraged by fanatic Mahommedans, and many Hindu women had to take shelter in rivers and tanks to protect their honour.' I do not propose to reproduce at length the other portion of his address, couched in similar violent and exaggerated language, calculated to rouse the baser religious and communal passions of my Hindu countrymen, which the Pandit thought fit to indulge in on that occasion. I consider even their repetition for establishing my position is in the highest degree detrimental to the cause of Indian Nationalism and a sin against inter-communal co-operation and goodwill. A few days after that address was delivered, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya came to see me at Simla in connection with a matter the nature of which it is unnecessary to mention here. On that occasion, I spoke to him earnestly about the new policy which he and his co-workers were adopting and warned him that persistence in rhetoric of this type, calculated to rouse the baser passions of the semi-educated masses, was sure to result in bloodshed. Alas ! that this unpatriotic course should have been persisted in with the result that the prophecy then made by me has at last come true.

And let us turn for a moment to another prominent figure in the Hindu Mahasabha movement. Presiding over the annual meeting of the Barra Bazar Hindu Sabha, Calcutta, on 25 July 1926. Dr. Moonje traced the history of lost Hinduism during the last nine hundred years quoting Afghanistan, Kashmir and Malabar as instances in point and also mentioning that India had lost 70 millions of her men to another religion. 'The object of the Hindu movement would be to keep together all Hindus and to extend the Hindu religion so that India might be called Hindustan, the land of the Hindus.... It seemed to him that the Hindus were living under two dominations, the political domination of the English based on its strength of machine-guns and the domination of the Mahommedans based on their aggressive mentality. The mild and docile Hindu was thus a prey to domination of two kinds and he had to see whether, while putting up with the machine-gun domination as an inevitable evil, he was also to put up with the other domination'. The political lesson thus inculcated by Dr. Moonje to his co-religionists has been carried a step further by him in his Presidential address at the Special Session of the Hindu Mahasabha, held at Patna on the 16th and 17th April last. During the course of that address, speaking of Hindu-Muslim unity, he observed as follows :

'This unity is to my mind a volatile commodity appearing very real and worth having till the price is paid, when it assumes the form of inpalpability and intractibility.' And having stated that he had never been a believer in pacts and concessions in bringing about Hindu-Muslim unity, he advised his co-religionists that 'they should leave Muslims severely alone in their present mentality and leave them to think and act as they pleased.' As I said only recently, whatever one may think of this astounding pronouncement, one cannot but admire Dr. Moonje's frankness in speaking out in plain language the inner feelings of the circles of which he and his co-workers are the leaders. And it is significant that he has been elected as President of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha for the ensuing year, with my friends Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Lala Lajpat Rai, Raja Narendra Nath and Raja Rampal Singh as Vice-Presidents.

As regards Lala Lajpat Rai's utterances since his desertion from the Swarajists' camp and entry into the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, it is sufficient to refer to the address delivered by him recently when presiding over the Sindh Hindu Conference, during the course of which he assured his co-religionists that if they were to put their own house in order, they would have to be strong enough to cope with the combined forces of the British Government and the Muslim community.

I have cited above only a few of the many pronouncements made by the three great leaders of this communal movement and where the leaders at the top have made such anti-Muslim pronouncements, the utterances of the numerous smaller fry throughout the country as well as the writings in that section of the Press which follows their lead can well be imagined. These

being the facts, is it then surprising that the resulting inter-communal bitterness and hatred have brought about the unhappy occurrences which have tarnished the fair name of India and have failed the hearts of those who sincerely desire her peaceful constitutional advancement towards full Responsible Government with feelings of deep despondency for her future ?

The only effective solution of the grave problem which we have now to face, is a change of mentality and of hearts on both sides. This once accomplished, the rest will follow as a matter of course. Let mutual suspicions be cast aside as absolutely groundless. Let Hindus and Mahommedans realise that they are but children of one common motherland. In the prosperity of both lies the prosperity of India and on the recognition by each of the legitimate rights of the other rests the hope of that inter-communal co-operation and goodwill which is absolutely essential if India is to attain her appointed goal. Religion, being a matter of individual belief, should be kept out of the political activities essential to the accomplishment of India's advance towards full Responsible Government within the Commonwealth of Nations known as the British Empire and craze after leadership should not make us forgetful of the sacred duty which we owe to our country. Let the Vernacular Press rise above that mentality which places increase of its circulation above the responsibility of giving the right lead to public opinion. Once these great needs of the moment are sincerely taken to heart, India's onward march to her constitutional goal will be accelerated and the desire of all patriotic hearts become certain of realisation.

Source : The Indian Review, December 1927, Vol. XXVIII.

48

MAHATMA GANDHI'S TRIBUTE TO HAKIM AJMAL KHAN

'In the death of Hakim Saheb Ajmal Khan the country has lost one of its truest servants. Hakim Saheb's was a many-sided personality...he was a courtier patriot. Though he passed his time among potentates, he was a thorough-going democrat. He was a great Mussulman and equally great Indian. He loved equally Hindus and Mussulmans and was in turn equally respected and loved by both. Hindu-Muslim unity was the breath of his nostrils. His later days were soured because of our dissensions. But he never lost faith in his country or his people. He felt that both the communities were bound in the end to unite.

Source : Young India, January 1928.

49

THE PRINCIPLE OF COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION

The principle of communal representation has everywhere received the consent and approval of practical politicians. But its opponents though outvoted have not been silenced.

The Muslims have not so far made any organised effort to defend a principle, which is the very breath of their political life in India.

The question of communal representation, in my opinion is not a new one. It has agitated the minds of legislators and statesmen in all ages. The ancient republics of Greece applied this same principle to ensure the fair representation of every class and community.

The Hindu Swarajists and nationalists condemn communal representation as something wicked. Saintly politicians are horrified to witness the immorality of communal representation. It is well to point out to them, the ethics of this much maligned principle.

The best proof of the desirability of a thing is that there is genuine need for it. If a thing is really indispensable for man then it cannot be immoral. For nature and her dictates are essentially moral. The fact that communal representation is absolutely necessary for us cannot be denied even by its worst enemies. The desire of millions of men in India for its maintenance is an irrefutable argument in its favour. To my mind, the expression 'necessary evil' is a contradiction in terms. What is necessary for the welfare of man cannot be evil and *vice versa*. There is another canon of political ethics which justified communal representation namely 'What concerns all must have the consent of all.'

Communal representation only aims at the fullest representation of the people in the Government of the country so that not even the least important class may be left out. It makes provisions of the effective *Safeguard* of the vital interests of the minorities. It holds out a definite assurance to them that no measure which affects their economic rights or religious liberties will be passed except by their consent.

The communal ill-feeling has kept on increasing for the last four or five years. Now it has become so acute that it has attracted considerable notice in England. Men of all shades of opinion agree that the communal tension between the Hindus and the Muslims is bad, but there are serious differences of opinion regarding the localization of its causes.

For a thorough diagnosis of the trouble we must take into account all those fine distinctions of caste and creed which slipshod politicians often find it convenient to ignore.

Simple minded and credible Englishmen like Lord Oliver have become dupes of the Swarajist propaganda. They have been bamboozled into the belief that communal representation is responsible for inter-communal riots, because it prevents moderate men from being elected to the Councils. It is clearly putting the cart before the horse.

Communal representation is not the cause but the inevitable effect of Hindu-Muslim disunity. The cries of Indian nationalism have been so repeatedly dinned into the ears of the British public and parliament that they are reluctant to believe that there exists no such thing as a United India. But the phenomenon of Hindu-Muslim estrangement strikes them forcibly and they try to explain it away. Moreover the people of England are in the habit of placing country before religion. They obviously do not understand why Indians should not sacrifice all considerations of religion at the altar of patriotism. Lala Lajpat Rai, a typical Hindu nationalist, in replying to Sir Abbas Ali in the *Times* of London drew a false analogy between the Hindus and the Muslims when he referred to the case of protestants and catholics living amicably under a national denomination. The Lala deliberately ignores the fact that while catholics and protestants are two sects of one and the same religion Islam and Hinduism are quite different religions. Here I may point out to the veritable cant that religion is a personal concern and has nothing to do with politics. I do not perceive the logic of those who want to keep religion and politics apart in watertight compartments. I consider it a sacrilege to say 'I am an Indian first and a Mussulman afterwards.' It must be a narrow definition of religion, indeed, that excludes politics from its ken. Religion according to Islam does not consist in an elaborate system of ceremonials and rituals. It is the set of all those moral, social and intutive dispositions of man that regulate his daily conduct. A Muslim people's political, social and economic life is inseparably bound up with their religion. Religion is the be-all and the end-all of a Muslim. Piety and politics have in the Islamic system, blended each in the other to produce a sublime unity of life.

The so-called Indian Nationalists do not perceive any rhyme or reason in the communal representation and its necessary adjunct separate electorates. If Mr. Lajpat Rai had analysed the heterogeneous elements that dominate the political and religious life of India, he would not have given such utterance to the jargon of Indian nationalism. The term 'Indian nation' appears to me to be a misnomer. It is merely an abstract notion devoid of any substance. India, it can be safely said, is a continent rather than a country inhabited by *many* nations and not *one* nation as the 'Nationalists' would have us believe. Even from a purely geographical point of view, India is not a single unit but a confused mass of units. The British rule in India gave a political unity to India in name but socially and morally Hindus and Mussulmans remained as wide apart as ever.

Community of interest is said to be the strongest plea for 'Nationalism'.

The Indian nationalists generally take their stand upon it. Their pretended faith in the common destiny of Hindus and Muslims is a sentimental sophistry which does not stand the test of criticism. A little consideration would show that it is the piercing point in the swarajist stronghold where it is easiest to assail them. I believe I do not exaggerate in asserting that the interests of the Hindus and the Muslims run counter. It is due to this vital opposition of their interests that they so readily pick up quarrels about trifles.

The Hindus have established themselves into a sort of 'Privileged class'. They hold the monopolies and enjoy the 'Good things of life' to the utter exclusion of the poor Muslims. The Hindu Swarajists, 'Responsivists' and Sanghatanists are all in league for a complete exploitation of the Muslims. These sham patriots and lip-democrats are in favour of making an oligarchy of what ought to be a commonwealth. Trade, industry and banking are their sole privileges. There is no paucity of skilled Muslim artisans and craftsmen; neither commercial enterprise nor business instinct is wanting in the Mussulmans; but they have no capital to lay out in business. It is money that makes the mare go and money the Muslims have not.

The Government even if it be willing is powerless to help the Muslims sufficiently in tiding over their financial difficulties in face of organized Hindu opposition. Many a time the Government has lent the helping hand to the Muslim community but seldom with good effect, thanks to the fraternal devotion of their Hindu friends. Whenever the Government wanted to buttress the Muslims their economic strivings, the Hindu compatriots made lot of fuss about it and openly branded the British bureaucracy for showing undue favour and partiality to the Muslims.

No machinery that was set up by the Government for the improvement of the economic condition of the Muslims could work smoothly because the Hindus always took good care to put obstacles in its way which stopped the wheels. Even when the Hindus are compelled to submit to a measure likely to benefit the Muslims such as the Punjab Money Lender's Bill, they always do so 'Under protest.' The Muslims who were ruthlessly shut out from all the profitable employments look to Government service, especially to the nation-building departments for the means to their sustenance.

'The notorious loaves and fishes' were the last desperate resort of a starving people. Here as elsewhere the Muslims found the Hindus bent upon fighting every inch of the ground. Why the Muslims are made to suffer, both in grist and meal ? The Hindu attitude can be summed up in the proverbial saying 'Heads I win, tales you lose'. Let the Sangathanists say what they may, a whole community is not going to die without making an effort. It is high time that the Hindus acted upon the principle of 'give and take' to prevent a civil war on the blessed day of the advent of Swaraj. The indigent Muslims are groaning under heavy economic pressure. They are without any national capital to build up their finances. The usurious money lender is eating like canker into their vitals. The Muslims are unable to stand upon their legs, for the present at least, unless they are backed up by the Govern-

ment. A government which Hindûs over-whelmingly preponderate would not do the needful for them. Therefore it is in order to safeguard their vital interests that the Muslims stick to the principle of communal representation. Hindu nationalists have a wonderful knack of turning everything to their account. Their 'Swarajism' is merely a convenient sop for gagging the mouths of discontented Muslims. Their clamour against communal representation is a cloak cleverly invented to hide the real motives working behind the Swarajist agitation.

When the Muslims lost their kingdom in India, the Englishmen superseded them. Into the shoes of the house of Timur stepped the 'peaceful merchants' who came to India 'for the purposes of trade'. Naturally the Muslims could not take kindly to the culture and institutions of the conquerors. There was a severe opposition to western education. As a consequence, education on western lines was completely disregarded by the Muslims. The Hindus had been for centuries accoustomed to alien rule and foreign institutions of learning. For them it was merely a change of masters. It mattered little to them whether they acquired knowledge through the medium of Persian or English. So they readily change the *Aba* for the *Gown*. Thus the Hindus got the most favourable start and they made good their opportunity. Fifty years later when Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, the pioneer of western education in his community started the M.A.O. College, the Muslims were hopelessly handicapped. Since then the Hindus have run the race so well that they have never allowed the Muslims to make up the distance.

All talk of unity is idle so long as the Hindus consider it a religious obligation to shed human blood in retaliation for the slaughter of cows and chopping off the branches of the sacred peepal tree. The Muslims sacrifice thousands of cows on the occasion of *Eid-uzzoha*. But it is an unpardonable sin in the code of Hindus religion; which is not redeemable even by capital punishment. How many lives are lost every year for the sake of a single cow. The Arrah and Katarpur atrocities are still green in the memory of the Muslims. The Hindus must snub their religious proclivities before they can hope to win the sympathy of Muslims for the cause of Swaraj.

There can be no true unity between the weak and the strong. What generally takes place is that the weaker party submits to the stronger one perforce. The unwilling surrender never makes their breasts clear of malice and hatred against their conquerors. A secret desire for taking revenge always lurks in their minds, and whenever they get opportunity they payback the compliment with a vengeance. The Hindus are far superior to Muslims in education, in wealth, in organisation, and for the matter of that in every walk of life. Unless and until the Muslims come on a level with the Hindus they cannot with any show of self-respect meet the Hindus more than half way. The Hindus will not feel grateful for any sacrifice on the part of the Muslims. They will only wantonly exult in their exploitation of the Muslims. There is no grace in giving what we have not the power to withhold.

The Mussulmans should first of all make themselves physically strong, economically independent, and educationally fit and then their favours and sacrifices will be gratefully acknowledged by the Hindus. Without equality there can be no unity between the Hindus and the Muslims and hence arises the necessity of separate communal organization. It may be urged by the opponents of communalism that why not work for the uplift of the whole nation, and organise the people irrespective of caste and creed, so that each community which is a component part of the whole may be equally benefited. My only answer to this question is that it is a very laudable suggestion only if it were practical. The factors of conflict and dissent are too many and too strong to be obliterated to work side by side.

Interest, as we have seen, has become an apple of discord instead of being a bond of union. Intellectual sympathy which is another strong link in the chain of unity is also missing. Several reasons may be given for this. In the first place there is no common language in India and hence no common literature. In the second place there is a clash of cultures and traditions. The Muslims have inherited from their ancestors noble traditions of learning and civilization, which cannot stoop to be in tune with the irrational ideals of Hindu life and thought. A common stock of ideas or traditions might in course of time, have softened the communal prejudices of the Indian people and tended to unite them in a nation. Some optimists, until recently entertained great hopes of Hindu-Muslim unity as an outcome of western education. This hope, though not well founded, might have been partly realised had it not been for the other counter-acting causes. This hope however was destined to be nipped in the bud.

The British occupation of India was a remarkable phenomenon, which was moulding the destiny of India, through a course of peaceful evolution. But just at the time, when the influence of western culture was beginning to be broadly felt Hindu renaissance and Vedic revival movement appeared on the scene and upset the whole thing. The Shuddhi and Sanghatan gave a new turn to the current of Indian nationalism. Political outlook shifted from the national to the communal angle of vision, surely there can be no disparity between two peoples greater than the disparity of mind and purpose.

The caste and untouchability are an affront and insult to the millions of Indians who on account of mere accident of birth are denied their birth rights of equality. The very touch of a shudra is regarded as pollution by a high-caste Brahman. But the nationalists go on singing to the tune of unity and at the same time allow the high-caste men to spurn and disdain the non-Brahmans. They brazen-facedly appeal to the out-castes, to muster strong round the standard of swaraj while they (the untouchables) are subjected to all kinds of abject and humiliating treatment. Why the non-brahman proletariat should fight the battle of swaraj only to be deprived of the fruits of their labours later on ? Mr. Gandhi says that Sanatan Dhrama is enough for his spiritual solace and satisfaction, yet the same Sanatan Dhrama preaches

the doctrine of untouchability and strictly enjoins upon its followers the restrictions of caste. If Mr. Gandhi is really a friend of the untouchables and an enemy of caste, then how can he reconcile himself to orthodox Hinduism ? To the Muslims the Hindu nationalists, 'born with swaraj on their lips' are not more generous. The Swarajist attitude towards the Frontier Reform Bill is a glaring example of the swarajist hypocrisy. The swarajists must give practical proofs of their goodwill towards the Muslims by frankly accepting the principle of communal representation and giving the Muslims their due share in the Government of the country. The Sanghatan and Shuddhi must go out of the pale of Hindu politics to make way for a broad national outlook and a brotherhood of all Indians. The narrow Mahasabha cult has done more than any other thing to the cause of unity. But the Hindus are unwilling to leave these shameful tactics, designed to ruin the Muslims and reduce them to the position of an insignificant minority.

Another fruitful source of the present Hindu-Muslim tension lies in the longing of Hindus for swaraj at the earliest date. The Muslims are not in the present state of things willing to have any further extension of Reforms unless they get definite pledge and security that their rights as a potentially important community will be fully respected in any Home Rule regime that India may have in future. Otherwise all sensible Muslims are unanimously of opinion that they are much better off under the British bureaucracy. The Swarajist party naturally resents this attitude of the Muslims and tries by all sorts of means to diminish the moral character-force of Muslim opposition in the eyes of the British public and parliament. This explains the Hindu campaign carried in the English and Anglo-Indian press against communal representation and mixed electorates. The Muslims on the one hand are convinced that only the communal representation can settle the anomalies of the Indian political life. The Hindus on the other hand are bent upon weeding it out by the roots.

The speeches that Lord Irwin has made regarding communal representation are very disappointing to the Muslims. He threw cold water on the aspirations of the Muslims when he said that the Government of India is prepared to extend communal representation for two or three years more. It is needless to say that Muslims are going to abide by this principle indefinitely until India gets Swaraj and even then it will form the basis on which the Swaraj government will be organised. But leaving aside these speculations, let us consider what would be the result if communal representation is abolished and mixed electorates are introduced. Firstly, Hindu-Muslim relations will become more bitter and strained as an inevitable result of the application of law of repulsion in placing together the elements of conflict. Secondly, the Hindus who have already got the lion's share in the Government will by the help of their immense wealth and resources keep the Muslims further out from Government service. The Muslims having no confidence in Hindu officials will raise the standard of revolt against them. Thirdly, corruption will creep

into elections. The Muslims will not be able to elect those who possess their confidence, so, in a more or less degree, the case will be with the Hindus. The election campaign will become a sort of hocuspocus compromise between the Hindus and Muslims and no party will be the better for it. Instead of creating unity and harmony it will sow seeds of discord and disruption in the political soil of India. Contentment and peace follow in the wake of political confidence and economic security. Separate electorates will only give a giddly delight to the few who can feed their hungry stomachs with mere names of all the choicest dainties of the dinning table and will not confer any lasting benefit upon the people. The poor Muslims want bread and they are fed upon soothing words and oily phrases. Therefore, His Excellency would do well to support communal representation as the only safe basis of Hindu-Muslim agreement.

However I am not a pessimist, I am convinced that Hindus and Muslims can yet live peacefully and contentedly in India. Unity is both possible and easily attainable. But I use the word 'unity' in a sense vastly different from that in which it is used in the Nationalist parlance. I mean by it alliance and co-operation between the Hindus and the Muslims. There can be no question of a single nationality of Hindus and Mussulmans. Some such union as that of the English and the Scotch may at best be realised by the utmost stretch of patriotism. In Islam there is no great scope for exclusive territorial patriotism. Indian Muslims cannot with any justice to their faith leave off 'Pan Islamism' for the sake of their Hindu fellow countrymen. A unity with non-Muslims as the result of which the Muslims loose their very denominational existence and become submerged in the ocean of Indianism is expressly forbidden in the code of Islam. This narrow and false type of patriotism has only been successful in setting one country against another. It stirs international jealousies. It pampers to the pride and arrogance of Imperialistic countries. In short it is the root cause of the malady known as land grabbing which is responsible for the enslaving of more than three-fourths of the human race. All our Round Table Conferences and unity pacts should give recognition to and make allowance for the fact that Muslims and Hindus belong to different catagories viz., Islam and Hinduism. And hence the principles that govern their agreement or difference ought to be those that are by constitutional practice applied to international politics. My thesis therefore is that Hindu-Muslim relations must need be viewed from a purely international and not an Indian point of view. Just as many nations in Europe are living peacefully in *entente cordiale*. 'Why cannot the Hindus and the Muslims do so ?' I ask in the name of Heaven, if we are slaves and we want freedom let us make a common cause and unite in the struggle for independence.

Source : The Aligarh Mail, January 1927.

50

THE U. P. MUSLIM ALL-PARTIES CONFERENCE

The U. P. Muslim All-Parties Conference commenced its proceedings at Cawnpore, on the 4 November 1928 at 4·30 p. m. Among those present were the Raja of Salimpur, Nawab Jamshed Ali Khan, Nawab Ismail Khan, Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtullah, Nawab Ali Hassan Khan, Nawab Murtaza Hussain Khan, Mr. Kidwai, Dr. Shafi Ahmad Khan, Maulana Shafi Daudi, Mr. Hasrat Mohani and a few other prominent Maulanas and members of the community.

Khan Bahadur Hafiz Hidayat Hussain, welcoming the delegates, said that the Conference had been summoned to arrive at a via media for the betterment of the community. Muslims stood for complete independence. It was regrettable that they had to determine their own share in the future Government of the country. The majority community was not in the last charitable towards them. The Nehru Report had taken no account of the present position and the condition of the Muslims, and their point of view. It was therefore a one-sided production. No Muslim had shared in its preparation, Mr. Shuab Qureshi having left the committee in despair, and Sir Ali Imam having attended only one sitting. The greatest draw-back of the Nehru Report, said the speaker, was that power was concentrated in the Central Government, where Muslims would always remain in a minority. He advocated federal system of Government which would provide for provinces where the Muslim majority could retaliate the treatment meted out to their community in the Hindu Provinces. He also criticised the dictum of the committee on separate electorates which he said, were essential to the political education of their community. He was also opposed to adult sufferage which could not be availed of by Muslims, for their women lived under purdah. In conclusion he put fourth seven demands of the Muslims: (1) separate electorates should be maintained in all legislative and autonomous bodies including universities and intermediate education boards, etc; (2) reservation of seats should continue as at present; (3) no legislative measure should be permissible if opposed by three-fourths of their community; (4) one-third of the appointments in all departments should be given to Muslims except in the police and army where the 50 per cent ratio should be maintained; (5) a half share in provincial Government should be granted to Muslims; and (6) one-third share in the Central Government should be maintained; and (7) protection for the Urdu language should be afforded.

In the course of his presidential address, Maulana Shaukat Ali said that

he was a humble servant of Islam and his motherland. He stood for a heart to heart and real understanding between the Hindus and Muslims, and had not changed his ideals. Circumstances had forced him to speak what he was going to say that day.

He was proud of the Muslim sacrifice and suffering of 1920 and 1921 which emancipated the Congress from a crawling situation and placed it on a glorious and successful career. Muslims contributed about Rs. 60 lakhs towards the National Khilafat funds and went to jail in untold numbers. Many national papers such as Pandit Motilal Nehru's '*Independent*' were subsidised out of these funds, and Mahatma Gandhi toured in the country at their expense. Everything was then thought to be glorious. The times however had changed and the blind passion of communal hatred had created blood-shed and ruin in the whole country. Several well-organised pre-arranged violent attacks were made on Muslims who suffered all patiently, and their leaders asked them to behave with their sister community as brothers. Muslim gentlemanliness was still manifest in the conduct of certain Muslims who were siding with Hindus on the issue of the Nehru Report.

We could have wiped out a community by annihilating the Hindus when we were rulers of India and wielded absolute powers. But Islam never wanted us to crush down the weak. But in spite of all this, the Hindus with their leaders of to-day, were deadly opposed to Muslims and their just interests. The Hindus were well organised by virtue of Mahasabha, and he failed to find any thoughtful Hindu who could check its aggressive and hostile activities. Much less did he find parallel Muslim organisations which could balance these activities.

The Maulana said that he asked Pandit Nehru at the time of the Calcutta riots to control the unruly Hindus, but he could not spare time on account of elections. The Maulana desired to let the Hindus understand that Moslems could not be subdued under any circumstances. They were brave, unyielding by nature. He instanced the Assembly resolution regarding the granting of Reforms to the North-West Frontier Provinces, to show that Pandit Motilal Nehru and the Swaraj Party were not unbiassed. Further, he referred to the Simla Unity Conference, which has failed due to Hindu obduracy. He detailed the course of events relating to the Unity Conference at Calcutta and the Madras Congress which had arrived at certain amicable decisions which were later confirmed by the All India Muslim League and the Khilafat Conference as well as the Jamiat-ul-Ulema. But Pandit Motilal Nehru made persistent efforts both at the Delhi and Bombay All-Parties Conference to undo the Madras Congress achievements. He was grieved at present to observe that no Hindu was available who could say that the Madras Congress was right and the Nehru Report was wrong. Hindus had been habituated to slavery, and they would remain slaves for long But the Mussulmans were freedom-loving people and could not submit to either Hindu or British rule.

The Maulana said he wanted unity but could brook no insult to Muslims. He desired the Hindus to declare in clear terms whether they wanted peace or a civil war. If they wanted war, Muslims were prepared to take up the challenge any moment. Even though the Hindu Mahasabha might organise Hindus and prepare them by means of Mahabir Dals and Akharas for years, he felt sure that Muslims could always be victorious, born-fighters as they were. If they wanted peace then the methods adopted by them for the purpose had so far resulted only in bloodshed and brought the future hopes of the country and national life to zero point. He was against the Nehru Report because it had been prepared with a view to remove the Hindu Mahasabha's grievances and bring the moderates into the national movement. He could not congratulate Pandit Motilal Nehru because he was responsible for reopening the decisions of the Madras Congress not only on constitutional points, but also on communal adjustments. Mr Shuaib Qureshi had been duped into appending his signature to a thing which he disapproved. He was influenced upon with undue tactics to withdraw his dissent and before he could get the wrong righted, the report was published. Even at the All-Parties Conference there was little consideration given to the voice of the Maulana who kept quiet because of hostile demonstrations by some of his Muslim brethren. He was glad to find that the Muslims of the country in general agreed with him and gave him their best support by conferring upon him the honour of presiding over the Conference for which he was most thankful. In conclusion the Maulana asked the Mussulmans to organise themselves for ten years at least with untiring energy and incessant labour so as to make their position unshakable. This was the particular moment for sustained efforts as there was danger to Islam in their negligence.

RESOLUTIONS

The Subjects Committee of the Conference which met on this day was not open to the press. Two hundred and six persons registered themselves as delegates; three associations did not send any delegates on the ground that they were not political bodies. There was separate seating arrangement for Purdahnashin ladies. The attendance including delegates, visitors and volunteers, ranged between 600 and 800. To-day's sitting of the Conference lasted about three hours. Five resolutions were moved.

I

The first resolution ran as follows : 'The All-Parties' Moslem Conference, U.P., fully appreciates the proposal to hold an All-Parties' Conference, and make it a great success.'

This was moved by K. B. Hafiz Hidayat Hussain, and seconded by Mr. Mushir Husain Qidwai.

During discussion Mr. Murtaza Hussain Abdi wanted to make a statement before the conference, to the effect, that the All-Parties' U.P. Moslem Conference was constituted by men who had either no opinion or ever if they had any, were anti-National and anti-Hindu, and could not claim to be a body representative of all shades of Moslem opinion. A packed audience like that could not have the moral right to speak in the name of all the Mussulmans in the provinces. He further took objection to the presidential address which he styled as a 'phillipic' and as full of vituperation against those who were not ready to lose their heads like the Maulana. Mr. Abdi felt it a veritable agony to hear the Maulana in that strain attributing motives to all those Hindu and Moslem leaders who had the misfortune to differ from him and support the Nehru Report. The unfortunate Maharaja of Mahmudabad had been unceremoniously handled by men, who if they were worth their salt, should feel eternally grateful to the Maharaja. He wanted the conference to know that the Moslem opinion in U. P. was preponderately for joint electorate and the Nehru Report. The reactionaries should not forget that it was difficult, nay, impossible to deceive people by raising the cry of 'Islam in danger'.

As the speaker began to read his statement he was hooted from all quarters and was required to quit the hall. The President asked the speaker not to proceed with his statement, which was a reflection on the conference, but to speak only on the resolution before the conference, if he so desired. As the speaker was not allowed to read his statement, he left the hall. The resolution was then passed.

II

The second resolution stated : 'In the opinion of this House, the future constitution should be a federal one in which provinces and Indian States should be given full autonomy, enjoying fullest freedom in matters of internal administration. The Central Government should have the right to exercise authority in matters which concern the whole country. In the opinion of this House any system of Government which conflicts with the above mentioned principles will in no case be acceptable to Muslims.'

Maulana Hasrat Mohani, in moving the resolution, said that he was not opposed to the Nehru Report, provided it was amended in certain respects. He could not regard a unitary system of Government as suited to the present disturbed condition of the country. The federal system on the other hand, would give equal opportunity to each community to behave with others tit for tat. Separation of Sindh according to the report could be effected only on acquiring Dominion Status which could not be had for fifty years to come, and therefore meant a vain hope for Moslems.

Maulana Hussain Ahmed moved an amendment that the following words be added to the resolution : 'Whether it is framed by the Nehru Committee

or Simon Commission or any other body.' The amendment being accepted by the mover, the resolution was passed without opposition.

III

The third resolution on separate electorate was moved by Mr. Zahur Ahmed, which declared that in view of the circumstances prevailing in the country, the Mussulmans of the United Provinces were not prepared to give up separate electorates.

The mover said that Moslems were not prepared to relinquish this sacred right. They did not want a change of masters from the English to the Hindu, for slavery under the latter would be all the more intolerable. Let not the Hindus think themselves to be masters by virtue of their majority. Communal riots were not the result of separate electorates, but were due to the Hindus' unjustifiable attitude in regard to cow sacrifice and music before mosques. Unfair treatment of Moslems by Hindu leaders was well demonstrated in Mr. Asaf Ali's election struggle at Delhi.

Mr. Hafizur Ahmad, Editor, 'Aligarh Mail', seconding the resolution, said that joint electorates working fully in USA did not eschew religious animosity as was evident in the presidential election of America. He further pointed out that the experience of the working of joint electorates in special constituencies did not advance any hopes for Moslems.

Mr. Hafiz Mahomed Sidique opposed the resolution, for he could not subscribe to the view that communal electorates were a proper remedy for the undisputable evil of Muslims being in a minority. The best was to make the Hindus come to their doors in search for votes, and thus make them agreeable to Moslems. The speaker was subjected to continuous interruptions, and had to sit down ultimately.

Hafiz Mahomed Usman, Secretary, Khilafat Committee, Aligarh also spoke in favour of joint electorates. The audience was not prepared to give him a patient hearing, and the president had to exert his influence over the audience to allow him to proceed. His speech was then interrupted by numberless interrogations. In the short time allowed to him, he said that elections to district boards of the Punjab were conducted on the basis of joint electorates and even though the Hindus were in a majority in certain districts the Moslems were represented far above their numerical strength.

Maulana Shaukat Ali, intervening, corrected the speaker by saying that the Punjab was a province where Moslems were in majority. On the whole, they had to think of the provinces where Moslems were in a minority.

The speaker proceeding said that the best way for keeping Lala Lajpat Rai and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya 'who were always anxious to suck the blood of Moslems' out of the legislature, was to resort to joint electorates.

About half a dozen persons followed in support of the resolution, the general trend of the arguments being that it was unwise to make another

experiment of the trusting Hindus which had been tried and found unsuccessful.

Mr. Kidwai was another who opposed the resolution, and cited instances of advanced Moslem countries like Turkey, Afghanistan and Persia who were progressing and enjoying freedom simply because they got rid of such evil considerations. They could not possibly enjoy freedom from British Imperialism unless they arrived at some understanding with the majority community.

Mr. Zahur Ahmad, replying to the opposition, said that Moslem minority of 15 versus 85 per cent could not be effective enough to gain an advantage over communally minded Hindus in joint electorates.

IV

The next resolution read as follows : 'In the opinion of this conference, with a view to protect the interests of Moslems, the following safeguards in the constitution of India are absolutely necessary : (1) adequate and effective Moslem representation should be provided by means of separate electorates in all legislative and other bodies created and controlled by the legislature, (2) representation of the Moslems in various Provincial Cabinets as well as the Imperial Executive Council shall not be less than 1/3, (3) neither the Central nor Provincial Legislatures shall make any law affecting Moslems which is repugnant to the personal law of Moslems, (4) Moslems shall be provided with every facility for teaching Urdu, Arabic, Persian and the development of their culture, (5) full protection should be granted to mosques, cemetries, Khankas and slaughter houses and other religious and charitable institutions of the Moslems, (6) Mussulmans shall not be compelled to perform any act which constitutes a violation of their faith or religious observances, and shall not be placed under any disability by reason of their refusal to perform the same, (7) the Moslem community should be secured effective and adequate representation in the public services, (8) Moslem representation shall not be less than one-third in the Indian Legislature, (9) an adequate share shall be secured for the use of Moslems in respect of all grants allocated for educational, industrial, charitable, social and religious institutions, (10) any law, rule, regulation or official action which is repugnant to the above provisions or which conflicts or interferes with them shall be void and of no effect, (11) it will be open to any citizen to question the legality of any law, bye-law, rule, regulation and official action under the above provisions or any proceeding arising in respect of the same by a petition for decision to the Supreme court, (12) the Viceroy of India shall have the power to determine and declare and suspend any law or bye-law, which is repugnant to the said provision, (13) the Indian Legislature shall not have the power to amend, repeal or in any manner interfere with the provisions of the constitution effecting the fundamental right of the people or

the safeguards provided for the interests of the minority, (14) the Secretary of State for India should be given full powers of enforcing the safeguards for the protection of the interests of minority, and in case of continued failure of any authority controlled and created by law to carry out the safeguards, it will be open to the Secretary of State to deprive that authority of its powers, and take over the administration of such departments under his direct control.

Mr. Masoodul Hasan moved the above resolution. It was seconded by Nawab Jamshed Ali Khan. The resolution as moved originally had to be referred to a special committee for redrafting, as certain members of the audience desired a change in its phraseology.

The Committee after a few minutes' consultation presented the resolution to the Conference in the above form, and it was accepted unanimously.

An incident of some interest occurred in the Subjects Committee when Maulana Azad Subhani proposed that the Conference should declare itself in favour of complete independence.

Khan Bahadur Masoodul Hasan and some other persons objected to such declaration, which, in their opinion, would go against the best interests of Mussulmans.

Upon this, a number of women from their purdah gallery sent a written statement to the President saying that if men had not the courage to stand for complete independence, women would come out of purdah, and take their place in the struggle for independence.

Maulana Azad Subhani moved in the open Conference the following resolution : 'In the opinion of the All-Parties U. P. Moslems Conference, Mussulmans of India stand for the goal of complete independence, which shall necessarily take the form of a federal republic.'

In the opinion of the mover, Islam always taught freedom, and for the matter of that the Muslims of India would fail in their religious duty, if they were against complete independence. Though Indian Moslems were poor yet they were, the speaker was sure, devoted to Islam more than any other people on earth.

After a couple or more persons had spoken, the resolution was supported by Mrs. Hasrat Mohani, who said that she would ask the audience to go a step further, and declare in favour of 'Soviet republic' where the rich and poor would live under the same constitution. The resolution being put to vote was passed unanimously with the one dissenting voice of Mr. Mohammed Shafi.

V

The next resolution enjoined on every thoughtful Moslem to do some piece of constructive work by organising night schools, public lectures, libraries and reading rooms, and inducing Moslems to do some sort of

commercial business to improve their economical status. The resolution was moved by Maulana Shafi Daudi and seconded by Maulana Shaukat Ali himself and was passed unanimously.

The last resolution approved a list of twenty delegates to the All-Parties Moslem Conference at Delhi.

VI

In his closing speech, Maulana Shaukat Ali thanked the delegates and members of the Reception Committee for their efforts to make the Conference a success. After a vote of thanks to the chair, the Conference was closed.

A compromise having been brought about through the efforts of Dr. Ansari, the Bihar and Orissa All-Parties' Moslems Conference met at Patna on 9 December 1928 as one united body representing all shades of Moslem opinion under the presidency of Maulana Mahomed Ali. A large number of delegates from all over the Province were present, including Dr. Syed Mahmud, Mr. Shah Zubair, Khan Bahadur Ismail, Mr. Shafi Daudi, and Mr. Azad Subhani.

Maulana Mahomed Ali's presidential address was the first public pronouncement on the Nehru Report. In his address, the Maulana said whether the Nehru Report was good or bad, he would not consent to be under British domination. If they wanted to keep and make Islamic countries free, they should free India first from slavery. He wanted India to be ruled by Indians. He would not accept British, Hindu or Moslem Raj. All religions must be for God, and he was a believer in God's rule. He declared that in matters on which there was any commandment of God, he was a Moslem first and a Moslem last and nothing but a Moslem; but in matters relating to the good of India, he was an Indian first and an Indian last, and nothing but an Indian.

Moslems were not sent to the world to conquer half of it. They were sent to the world to convert the whole of it, and to conquer the hearts of all men and bring them into the fold of Islam. This could be achieved only by service and not by force. He would not give up his religious principles to please the Hindus. If they could not get rid of British rule, and there was no alternative but a Hindu Raj, he would prefer that Hindu Raj. When the British were gone, Mussulmans should demand their rights from Hindus, and the Hindus would give them the rights; but if the Hindus did not then concede those rights, they could get those rights even by force. They should not fear the majority. Islam's history taught them to trust God and have faith in their inherent strength.

In the days of the East India Company, the beat of drums was accompanied by the cry 'Creation is God's, the country is the King's, and the rule is that of John Company Bahadur'. The Nehru Report in a nutshell meant that the creation was God's, the country was the Viceroy's or of the Parliament's

and the rule was Hindu Mahasabha's. That was the meaning of accepting Dominion Status and yet denying Mussulmans' protection. They were not prepared to accept that position. It was said that no compromise was possible regarding Moslem demands, and that all such demands were characterised as communalism. But Pandit Motilal Nehru himself compromised with Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, the Raja of Mahmudabad and Sir Ali Imam and accepted Dominion Status. He quoted history to show that there had never been a majority rule in India; but for the first time now, the government of the country was going to be a majority rule. And yet communalism was only too rampant in both the great communities one of which was in a majority of 66 per cent and the other in a minority of 25 per cent.

If the minority put forward safeguards for the protection of its rights how could it be said that it was against the principle of human nature ? They had learnt from Mahatma Gandhi not to haggle like a Bania (shopkeeper) but to make their minimum demand on the basis of the Madras Congress and Calcutta Moslem League resolutions and to stick to it. Objections were raised to the extensions of the reforms to the North-West Frontier Province and separation of Sind, because these had a Moslem majority. Even in the provinces where Moslems had a majority, the Nehru Report was so planned as to counteract the influence of that Moslem majority by having too dominant a Central Government at Delhi.

The President's complaint was against the present Hindu mentality. He had no need to suggest amendments to the Nehru Report. Those responsible for the report would modify it themselve in the course of time. He asked the Hindus to change their present mentality. A change of heart on the part of the Hindu would enable both the Hindus and the Moslems to work together for their country. At present only too many Hindu leaders professed to be Nationalists, but were only communalists at heart. But only too many Moslem leaders professed or even boasted to be communalists, but were only self-seekers at heart. The nation was being exploited by both to its ruin (applause).

Source : **The Indian Quarterly Register, July to December 1928.**

51

NINETEENTH SESSION OF THE ALL-INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE : LAHORE MEET—SHAFI GROUP

31 December 1927—1 January 1928

The Shafi Group of the All-India Muslim League commenced its session on 31 December 1927, at Lahore in Habibia Hall, Islamia College, at 11.25 a.m. The hall was crowded.

Welcoming the delegates, Nawab Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan, Chairman of the Reception Committee, said he could not refrain from saying that he observed with a feeling of sadness that some of their prominent brethren who should have been present at the meeting were absent. The small body of Muslims holding its meeting at Calcutta had proved itself incompetent to understand the seriousness of the time and the intensity of the present situation.

Referring to the boycott of the Simon Commission, he said that the decision of an overwhelming majority of Mussulmans to co-operate with the Commission was not hastily adopted. It was the result of the profound knowledge and painful experience of the treatment meted out to them by the Hindus. There was no other course open to them, but to come to this conclusion. The Muslims as a minority community must vindicate their rights; and the only chance under the circumstances was to approach the Simon Commission with many composure and seek justice from it.

Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan then enumerated the following Muslim demands : (*i*) separate representation in the various legislatures and local bodies on a population basis; (*ii*) a system of separate electorates; (*iii*) separation of Sind from Bombay; (*iv*) reforms for the Frontier Province and Baluchistan; and (*v*) an adequate Muslim share in the services.

Referring to the last demand, Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan said, 'We declare it most emphatically that, while we have no desire to infringe on the rights of others, we strongly resent our rights being infringed on by others. We shall wait to see what notice Government takes of our complaint in this connection. If I were literally to interpret the sorrows of Muslims in this matter, I would say better a terrible end than terror without end.'

Concluding, Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan said that if further reforms were made in the provinces, the Punjab should not be denied provincial autonomy, as a strong desire for autonomous government thrilled their very sout. It was mostly the valour of the Punjabi soldier which saved modern civilization from utter ruin. Was it possible that with such a record and equipment for self-government, the Punjab was to be denied the right to have autonomy ? He

did not think that the British people would be so insensible to the demands of gratitude as to ignore their right to this high privilege.

Appealing to his Hindu fellow-countrymen, he said, 'It is not yet too late to adjust our differences. Everything depends on our unity. Utter the magic word that we are united, and the world will bow before you. Keep silent, and you remain in bondage. Together, we can master even a hostile fate. But if you do not accept the friendship we offer to you, the blame will rest with you.'

II

Sir Muhammad Shafi, who was presiding over the Session, then delivered his Presidential Address :

'I am sincerely convinced', he said, 'that in the existing political conditions in this country, joint electorates, whether with or without reserved seats, would be certain to furnish a periodical cause of friction between the two communities, and would, in consequence, be in the highest degree injurious to the cause of Indian nationalism.' Ridiculing the suggestion that separate electorates had been the cause of inter-communal friction, Sir Muhammad Shafi pointed out that separate communal electorates were first introduced as a result of the Minto-Morley Reforms, and for a period of years after their introduction, the two great communities had lived in an atmosphere of mutual co-operation and goodwill. One of the basic principles of the modern system of democratic government was that the legislature should be really representative of the people. The system of electorates in India must, therefore, be so framed as to give the fullest scope to the real representation of the population, including the Adi-Hindus and labour.

Referring to the Simon Commission, he said that what concerned the Muslim community was the provision in the Reforms Scheme of 1921 that the present Commission was to consider the working of the franchise and the constitution of electorates, including the important matter of retention of communal representation. He, therefore, requested all to settle their political differences, and then present a united Indian demand regarding the next step in the Constitutional advance. A unanimous demand thus made would be irresistible, no matter what the constitution of the Royal Commission might be.

The Muslim League, therefore, should call upon the sister communities to arrive at a satisfactory settlement of inter-communal political controversies, and to prepare a scheme of constitutional reforms which, while satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the Indian political intelligentsia, would, at the same time, ensure that the Muslim community and other minorities in India enjoy their just rights and the satisfaction of their reasonable aspirations.

He urged the appointment of a committee to collaborate with the committees appointed by other organisations to evolve a satisfactory scheme and

to bring about unanimity of public opinion.

Sir Muhammad Shafi demanded the introduction of constitutional and administrative reforms in the North-West Frontier and the separation of Sind from the Bombay Presidency. The speaker discussed the future reforms, and said that the existing control of the Secretary of State in departments dealing with internal affairs was not conducive to the best interests of administration. He suggested that the Government of India be relieved of the irksome chains with which they were bound in this respect.

Detailing his suggestions for immediate reforms in the central and provincial machineries, he urged, *inter alia*, that the Foreign and Political Department be placed in charge of one member; that an additional civilian member for the Army be appointed to take his place within the Indian Cabinet; and that membership of the Viceroy's Executive Council be increased to eight, four of whom should be Indians. He also felt that, in the Central Government, the member or members in charge of Transferred Subjects should be selected from among the elected representatives of the people in the Central Legislature and should be made responsible to it for their administration. As for dyarchy in the provinces, Sir Muhammad Shafi remarked that this interesting experiment should now be abandoned, and one should revert to the principle of unitary provincial governments.

He then dwelt on the question of the legality of the meetings of the Council of the All-India Muslim League held at Delhi on 20 November and 11 December respectively. He said he was elected President of the League by both the Council meetings, and the Punjab Muslim League duly approved of his election. The Council of the All-India Muslim League thus became *functus officio*. As far as the questions of venue and presidentship of the annual meeting were concerned, it was obvious that where the validity of a decision depended on the agreement of two parties, no one of them had any power to set it aside after the necessary agreement by the two had been arrived at, Dr. Kitchlew's pretence for calling the meeting of 11 December was Sir Muhammad Shafi's statement to the press that he would relinquish the presidentship in favour of the Aga Khan, should the latter be willing to support separate Muslim electorates.

That, said Sir Muhammad Shafi, was obviously a matter between the Aga Khan and himself; and until he had finally tendered his resignation of the presidentship, there was no occasion for calling another meeting of the Council to decide what had already been finally settled on 20 November. Therefore, the meeting held on 11 December was entirely illegal; and he did not know under what rule and authority Maulvi Mohammad Yakub was elected President of the Calcutta Session of the League, held the day before. This election took place without even sending any intimation to members of the Council of the All-India Muslim League, who were in Lahore, Therefore, said Sir Muhammad Shafi, he, as the truly elected President of the All-India Muslim League, declared the meeting in Calcutta to be illegal.

The Session then adjourned, after forming a Subjects Committee to discuss draft resolutions.

III

The Session resumed its sitting at 3.30 p.m. to consider the draft resolutions reviewed by the Subjects Committee.

Mr. Ghaznavi moved the first resolution which ran as follows :

This Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League invites the leaders of all non-Muslim communities in India to come to a satisfactory settlement with the Muslim community, before the Royal Commission begins its work regarding the future Constitution of India and the rights and interests of the Muslim community, as embodied in the foregoing resolutions, with a view to the joint preparation of a Draft Constitution for India, adequately safeguarding the legitimate rights and interests of all communities, for presenting the same before the Statutory Commission or the British Parliament or both.

In moving the resolution, Mr. Ghaznavi advised the audience not to boycott the Commission, which would be prejudicial to Muslim interests. Points of order were raised by Mr. Afzal Haq and Raja Ghaznafar Ali Khan that the speech the mover was reading had no relevance to the subject under discussion.

The President, however, allowed the speaker to continue.

After a few minutes, Mr. Aurangzeb Khan also rose a point of order and asked the President to inform the House on which resolution the mover was making the speech.

Maulana Akhtar Ali Khan asked the President whether there was any time-limit for the mover of the resolution.

Amidst constant similar interruptions, Mr. Ghaznavi had to hurry through his speech.

Maulana Hasrat Mohani, seconding the resolution, said their experience of the non-cooperation days showed that a boycott of the Commission would not succeed. They should, therefore, put their heads together and frame a Constitution for India which they should place before the Simon Commission and if it was not accepted, there would still be time for a boycott. He did not think that they had been insulted by the exclusion of Indians from the Commission. The insult was in the appointment of the Commission itself. He therefore advised that they should not talk of boycott at the present state.

Chaudhri Afzal Haq (Khilafatist) next rose to speak and was greeted with loud shouts of *Allah-o-Akbar* by the Khilafatists, who had turned out in greater strength for the afternoon sitting. He said that, if a mutual understanding with sister communities in India was their objective, they should devote their attention to that question; why should they bring in the Royal Commission at all in the resolution ?

At this stage, the speaker was again greeted with loud cheers by the Khilafatists; and the President made an appeal for order. On this, more confusion followed. Dr. Muhammad Alam and Malik Lakshan, both Khilafat leaders, came to the dais an appealed to the audience to stop all shouting. Within a few minutes order was restored; and Chaudhri Afzal Haq continuing, said that the fact that the boycott programme during the non-cooperation days failed provided no reason why they should give up boycotting the Royal Commission. He believed that no programme in the world was ever carried out completely or successfully to the satisfaction of all. As Mussulmans, it was their duty to convert the whole world to Islam. Had they been able to do it ? If they had not, should they give up Islam ? After 50 years of begging, all that the Government had given them was separate electorates. Was that the be-all and end-all of Muslim aspirations ? From his own experience in the Punjab Legislative Council, he could say that they, the Mussulman members of the Council, had gained nothing by co-operting with the Government. For six years, the Government took advantage of the Muslim cooperation, and when it found that the Hindus and Mussulmans were fighting with each other and the Mussulmans' co-operation was no longer necessary, it did not care for them any more.

He wanted to move an amendment to the resolution; but as he had exceeded the time-limit, the President asked him to resume his seat.

Mr. Masud-ul-Hasan, supporting the resolution, said the boycott would do great harm to the Muslims, who were ruining their interests by swallowing poisonous pills in the shape of Indian nationalism.

Dr. Muhammad Alam moving an amendment proposing the deletion of the last portion of the resolution, said that the resolution was really divided into two parts, both of which asked them to beg, and led them no where. He could, however, understand the sense of the first portion of the resolution, whereas the second portion, in his opinion, was meaningless. They should not welcome the Commission, as by sending an all-white Commission, the British Government had insulted them. He would refuse to beg and accept alms, even if the whole of India were offered to him. (Shouts of 'Hear, hear !') They would not gain anything by bowing before the Commission and kissing the feet of its members.

Mian Shah Nawaz, supporting the resolution, said that he refused to believe that all Mussulmans were flatterers of the Government and possessed a slave mentality. Mussulmans, in times of need and crisis, had sacrificed even their lives. What they wanted, the speaker continued, was that in framing a Constitution for India, the interests of the 7 crores of Muslims should be safeguarded.

Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan, supporting the amendment of Dr. Alam, said he was entirely in favour of the first part of the resolution and did not think that any Mussulman would oppose it, but the second part of resolution tended to divided them and raise controversial issue. If the League

was anxious to pass a resolution regarding the Commission, it could do so in the form of a separate resolution. The acceptance of the amendment did not prevent them from bringing a fresh resolution on the Commission; and it would still be open to them either to welcome or boycott it. He had wired to Mr. Jinnah that the boycott question should not be brought forward at the Calcutta Session of the League. He appealed to the audience not to be misled by the idea that because many prominent Mussulmans present in the gathering were in favour of welcoming the Commission, they should suspend their own judgment. They should not forget that equally capable and self-sacrificing Muslims had gathered in Calcutta to discuss this very question, and they should not ignore their views.

Mr. Aurangzeb Khan said he knew full well that the Commission would not bring any special blessings for them, but if it was boycotted, Muslim interests would suffer.

Mr. Anis Ahmad said that Muslims would not gain anything from Hindus, who treated their own brethren—the depressed classes—as untouchables.

Mr. Ali Bahadur Khan said that for five years, he was connected with the Khilafat and non-cooperation movements, but he could not understand the policy of Mr. Jinnah and the boycotters.

Mr. Mazhar Ali Azhar supported the amendment. He was sorry to see that they were all blaming the Hindus; the fact was that more of their rights were taken away by the British Government than by the Hindus. Muslims would gain nothing by begging. The Sikhs in the Punjab got whatever they wanted by their determined agitation. He wished that the Muslims would turn their attention to the numerous wrongs done to them by the British, and not blame the Hindus.

Mr. Zafarullah Khan said that, if they wanted to end the British domination they should either rise in an armed revolt or submit to the Parliamentary Commission. The first was not possible, and therefore, they should accept the Parliamentary Commission and submit their views before it, especially as the Hindus were engaged in active propaganda, placing their views before the British public in England.

Sheikh Hissamuddin supported the amendment, and said that, if the Mussulmans could stand on their own legs, no power on earth could destroy them, and that there was no necessity for them to beg before the Commission at this stage.

Dr. Alam moved the closure of the debate, which accepted by the President. But before he put the resolution to the vote, the President indicated that he also wished to speak on the resolution. He said that by keeping-away from the Commission, they would invite an *ex-parte* decree against them.

At this stage, Chaudhri Afzal Haq rose to a point of order and asked whether the President, being the Chairman of the meeting, could speak for the

resolution.

Dr. Alam also asked whether it was fair for the President to do so.

The President said that he had every right to speak, as his presidential position was not to be confused with the position of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

The amendment of Dr. Alam was then put to the vote, and declared lost by the President.

Dr. Alam and Mr. Afzal Haq claimed a division. The votes were counted by provinces. It was found that Bengal, the U.P., Bombay, Delhi, and the Frontier Province were against the amendment; and of the Punjab delegates 63 were in favour of the amendment and 101 against.

Dr. Alam challenged the counting of the Punjab votes. The President refused to re-count the vote; and he declared the amendment lost and the original resolution carried, amidst loud applause. Confusion and uproar now followed, which continued for some time. The Khilafatist, headed by Dr. Alam, left the hall, shouting, 'shame, shame', at the President and the organizers of the Session.

IV

Order being restored, the following resolution moved by Mr. Yamin Khan was then passed unanimously.

This meeting of the All-India Muslim League declares that neither the proposals formulated by some Muslims in their individual capacity at Delhi on 2 March 1927, in their original form, nor in their amended form as passed by the Congress at Madras, are acceptable to the Mussulmans of India.

The following three resolutions were put from the Chair and passed unanimously.

The first urged the introduction of constitutional reforms in the Frontier Province and Baluchistan; the second urged the separation of Sind from Bombay, with a reformed constitution of its own; and the third appointed a committee of 27 members, with Sir Muhammad Shafi as *ex-offico* member, to devise a scheme of constitutional advance and to collaborate with the committees appointed by other Indian organizations to frame a Constitution for India on the principles adopted by the Lahore Session.

Sir Muhammad Iqbal moved a resolution protesting against the existing arrangements whereby the Muslim community in Bengal and the Punjab was deprived of its majority rights in the Provincial Councils, and urged the Government to remove this injustice done to the Muslim in 1921.

This was also passed unanimously; and the Session then adjourned.

V

The Session reassembled on 1 January 1928, at 12.30 p.m. The attendence was thin, and the Khilafatists were not present. The President read two messages which he had received from Bengal. The first message, signed by 10 Muslims of Calcutta, including Mr. A. H. Ghazanavi, Dr. Suhrawardy, Khan Bahadur Imdad-ud-Din Ahmed, Sahibzada Ali Naqvi and others, stated that Muslim opinion in Bengal was behind the Lahore Session and wished it success, and asked Mr. Ghaznavi to move a resolution on the Statutory Commission. The second message was from four Bengali members of the All-India Muslim League, who regretted their absence, but recognized the Lahore Session, and asked the President to count on their votes for the Statutory Commission.

Dr. Shafaat Ahmad Khan moved the first resolution of the day, which asked the Government to earmark a reasonable share of the bonuses and grants-in-aid meant for various nation-building departments for the purpose of the Muslim community. He said his experience of the United Provinces and that of Mussulmans in other provinces was that a very large part of the grants earmarked for education was not spent on Muslim education. Whenever they had tried to ask for more money for Muslims, they had been dubbed reactionaries. Therefore, they had no other alternative but to demand that the Mussulmans should be given an adequate proportion of grants, otherwise they would be deprived of those advantages which they were entitled to get from the Government.

Mr. Shuja-ud-Din supported the resolution, which was then carried.

Mr. Masudd-ul-Hasan moved a resolution authorizing the President to call a round-table conference of Muslim Leaguers of all organizations to bring about unity of thought in political ideals amongst the Muslims of India. He said that they should make every effort to unite the various differing elements among Muslims. It was extremely unfortunate that they were so hopelessly divided, especially at this juncture, when one set of resolutions was being discussed at Calcutta and another at Lahore.

Mr. Gul Mohammad, seconding the resolution, said that their differences would be exploited by a third party, and that they would gain nothing from the Government if they went on fighting.

Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan rose to a point of order, and asked the President whether it was relevant to the subject under discussion to refer to incidents that took place outside.

The resolution was passed unanimously.

Sheikh Abdullah next moved a resolution authorizing the Council of the All-India Muslim League to appoint a committee to draft a new and suitable Constitution for the League as the present Constitution had become quite out of date.

The resolution was passed without discussion.

Sheikh Abdullah next moved the following resolution :

The All-India Muslim League hereby elects Sir Muhammad Shafi as its President, Sir Muhammad Iqbal as its General Secretary, and Maulana Hasrat Mohani as its Joint Secretary. The League also authorizes the Council to appoint Joint Secretaries for various provinces and to make suitable arrangements for the collection and expenditure of the funds of the League and to engage such paid servants or office-bearers as are necessary in the opinion of the Council for carrying out the work of the League.

Mr. Ghaznavi, seconding the resolution, paid tribute to the many qualities of head and heart of the President, and said that he had great pleasure in welcoming Sir Muhammad Shafi as President of the League. Turning to Sir Muhammad Iqbal, he said that Sir Muhammad Iqbal was not only known throughout India from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin but throughout the world. He had therefore equally great pleasure in seconding Sir Muhammad Iqbal as Secretary. Speaking about Mr. Hasrat Mohani, he said that Mr. Mohani needed no introduction at his hands. When a man like Mr. Hasrat Mohani had come to their side, after revising his previous opinion, it was a proof that there was right and reason on their side.

Mr. Fateh Mohammad supported the resolution.

Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan opposed the resolution, and said that he did not understand how they could support such a resolution, when they had appointed a round-table conference to bring about unity among the various sections of Mussulmans. They could not ignore the fact that another All-India Muslim League Session was being held at Calcutta, and that in the circumstances, they should not adopt such a course. He had nothing to say against the personality of Sir Muhammad Shafi or Sir Muhammad Iqbal but they should not adopt this resolution in the name of the All-India Muslim League. Mr. Jinnah was already the President of the All-India Muslim League.

At this stage, the President, interrupting the speaker, said, 'No, Mr. Jinnah is no longer President. He had ceased to be President from June 1927, when his term expired.' The President read the Rules of the League on this point.

Sheikh Mohammad Sadiq said that he had been sitting as a neutral since the previous day, listening to all the discussions; but the present debate on the resolution before them compelled him to speak out his mind. He was pained to find that objectionable remarks were made by some members about Mr. Jinnah, Dr. Ansari, Maulana Mohammed Ali and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, and that such speakers were not stopped by the President. When the Khilafatist were present in the hall the previous day, all the supporters of the President were sitting quiet; to-day, taking advantage of their absence, they were in a merry mood and passing all sorts of resolutions. This reminded him of the proverb, 'When the cat is away the mice are at play.' He had met Dr. Kitchlew last 14 December at Amritsar, when the

latter said that he had not resigned the secretaryship of the League. They should not take advantage of the absence of Mr. Jinnah, Dr. Kitchlew and other Muslim leaders from the present session and appoint office-bearers. The time would soon come when they would have to meet in conference over the Statutory Commission and the framing of a Constitution for India, when they would have to explain their actions. If they appointed the office-bearers now, they would have to face trouble at that conference. He asked Sir Mohammad Iqbal and Mr. Hasrat Mohani not to accept the offices offered to them. After concluding his speech, Mr. Sadiq left the meeting.

That part of the resolution which related to the election of Sir Muhammad Shafi was put to the vote by Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan, Chairman of the Reception Committee, and it was carried amidst acclamation.

Mr. Hasrat Mohani moved the last resolution of Session :

This Session records its sense of deep regret that the Hindus, as a community, should have rejected the decision of the Calcutta Unity Conference, regarding the question of cow slaughter and music before mosques, by means of unanimous resolutions passed at the All-India Hindu Mahasabhas, the All-India Aryan Congress, and now at the Madras Session of the Indian National Congress, in a form not acceptable to Muslim.

The resolution was passed and the session then concluded.

Source : The Indian Quarterly Register, 1927, Vol. II.

52

NINETEENTH SESSION OF ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE : CALCUTTA MEET—JINNAH GROUP

30-31 December 1927 and 1 January 1928

That the All-India Muslim League emphatically declares that the Statutory Commission and the procedure as announced are unacceptable to the people of India. It, therefore, resolves that Mussulmans throughout the country should have nothing to do with the Commission at any stage or in any form.

The All-India Muslim League authorises the Muslim League Council to appoint a Sub-Committee to confer with the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress and such other organisations, as they think proper, for the purpose of drafting a constitution for India in which the interests of the Muslim community will be safeguarded having regard to the following proposals which the League approves of and adopts, and subsequently take part in the National Convention which is going to take place in Delhi in

March next as suggested by the Congress :

(1) That Sind should be separated from the Bombay Presidency and constituted into a separate province;

(2) That reforms should be introduced in the North-Western Frontier Province and in Baluchistan on the same footing as in other provinces;

(3) That in the present circumstances the representation of Muslims in the different legislatures of the country through separate Muslim electorates is inevitable, and that Muslims will not accept any scheme involving the surrender of this valued right, unless and until Sind is actually made a separate province and the reforms aforesaid are actually introduced in the North-Western Frontier and Baluchistan Provinces, and that when these requirements are fully satisfied, Muslims will be prepared to abandon separate electorates in favour of joint electorates with reservation of seats fixed on the basis of the population of the different committees, subject to what is related hereinafter;

(4) In Sind, Baluchistan and the North-Western Frontier Provinces, the Muslim majority should make the same concession in regard to proportion of the seats reserved to the Hindu minority that Hindu majorities in other provinces would make to Muslim minorities over and above the proportion of the population of the Provinces which shall be the minimum basis; and

(5) In the Central Legislature, the Muslim representation shall not be less than one-third.

The League further resolves : (a) that in the future constitution of India, liberty of conscience shall be guaranteed, and no legislature, Central or Provincial, shall have power to make any law interfering with the liberty of conscience. 'Liberty of conscience' means liberty of belief and worship, freedom of religious observances and association, and freedom to carry on religious education and propaganda with due regard to the feelings of others and without interfering with similar rights of others; (b) that no bill, resolution, motion or amendment regarding intercommunal matters shall be moved, discussed or passed in any legislature, Central or Provincial, if a three-fourths majority of the members of the community affected thereby in that legislature, oppose the introduction, discussion or passing of such bill, resolution, motion or amendment. 'Inter-communal matters, means matters agreed upon as such by the joint standing committee of both communities of the Hindu and Muslim members of the legislatures concerned, appointed at the commencement of every session of that legislature.

This League resolves that without prejudice to the rights of the Hindus and the Mussulmans claim, the one to play music and conduct processions wherever they please, and the other to slaughter cows for sacrifice or food wherever they please, the Mussulmans appear to the Mussulmans to spare

Hindu feelings as much as possible in the matter of cow slaughter, and trust that the Hindus will appeal to the Hindus to spare Mussulman feelings as much as possible in the matter of music before mosques, and this League calls upon both the Hindus and the Mussulmans not to have recourse to violence or to law to prevent the slaughter of a cow or the playing of music before mosques.

This League further resolves that every individual or group is at liberty to convert or reconvert another by argument or pursuation, but that no individual or group shall attempt to do so or prevent its being done by force, fraud or other unfair means, such as the offering of material inducement. Persons under eighteen years of age should not be converted unless it be alongwith their parents or guardians. If any person under eighteen years of age is founded stranded without his parents or guardian by persons of his another faith, he should be promptly handed over to persons of own faith. There must be no secrecy at to the person, place, time and manner about any conversion or reconversion, nor should there be any demonstration or jubilation in support of any conversion or any reconversion. Wherever any complaint is made in respect of any conversion or reconversion that it was effected in secrecy or by force, fraud or other unfair means, or wherever any person under eighteen years of age is converted, the matter shall be enquired into and decided by arbitrators appointed jointly by the two communities.

Source : Jamiluddin Ahmad (ed.); *Historic Documents of the Muslim Freedom Movement.*

INDEX

ISLAMIC BOOK CENTRE

26-PAISA AKHBAR

ANARKALI, LAHORE